

Grand Valley State University

ScholarWorks@GVSU

Papers from the International Association for
Cross-Cultural Psychology Conferences

IACCP

2004

Women and Peacebuilding in a Multicultural Society

Saparinah Sadli

University of Indonesia

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/iaccp_papers



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

ScholarWorks Citation

Sadli, S. (2004). Women and peacebuilding in a multicultural society. In B. N. Setiadi, A. Supratiknya, W. J. Lonner, & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Ongoing themes in psychology and culture: Proceedings from the 16th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*.
https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/iaccp_papers/271

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the IACCP at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Papers from the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology Conferences by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

WOMEN AND PEACEBUILDING IN A MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY

Saparinah Sadli

University of Indonesia

Jakarta, Indonesia

My chapter is not a theoretical discourse on peacebuilding. Instead, it describes my observations and experiences about peacebuilding in a multicultural society such as Indonesia.

Let me start by saying that peacebuilding is a complex struggle in a world where militaristic domination is still a nearly universal reality. Nevertheless, attainment of peace is a dream for many of us who are living in societies where social and political conflicts have brought misery to many. Therefore, one of the major challenges we continue to face at the start of the new millennium is the achievement of a genuine lasting peace, at a global as well as national level.

A fundamental problem of peace is violence. While a concept of peace is more than the absence of war, peace will ultimately depend on the absence of armed conflict (Galtung, 1961). This sort of peace, also called negative peace, is essential to the transcendence of all other forms of violence. But genuine lasting peace requires the reduction and elimination of structural violence, derived from existing social and economic institutions such as traditions, social values or economic policies that cause experiences of violence in life and the reduction of well-being.

Statements of the conditions of justice and equity that comprise positive peace are included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Peace is the antithesis of exploitation, marginalization and oppression. Building lasting peace is in essence respecting human rights and human dignity. People, despite the diversity of race, ethnicity, religion, ideology, gender, and so forth, have the same basic needs and wishes: to be free from fear and free from want. The essence of it is: to live in peace and happiness.

Peace and Cultural Diversity

Culture takes diverse forms across time and space. It is embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the identities of the social groups that make up humankind. It is a source of exchange, innovation and creativity and is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. It is therefore the common heritage of humanity for the benefit of present and future generations. The process of globalization facilitated by the rapid development of information technology presents a challenge for cultural diversity. On the other hand, renewed aspirations for cultural identity have spurred intercultural conflicts. It is respect for human rights that guarantees cultural diversity.

Human rights are indivisible, interdependent, universal, and inalienable (Vienna, 1993). Cultural rights are an inherent part of human rights and include the right to be able to express oneself in the language of one's choice, the right to quality education and training that fully respect one's cultural identity, and a commitment to fundamental freedoms such as freedom from fear and freedom from want.

In all, respect for human rights is the essential prerequisite for peace building and includes a recognition that cultural diversity is the common heritage of humanity despite the fact that culture takes diverse forms across time and space.

Unity in Diversity

Indonesia's 200 million citizens form the world's fourth most populated country and, at 90% Muslim, the country has a greater number of Muslims than any other nation. Indonesia's 313 ethnic groups, many with distinct languages, live in an archipelago of more than 10,000 small and large islands (some data even suggest 17,000 islands). The archipelago spans more than 9,000 kilometers from east to west. While Islam is the religion of the majority population, other religious belief systems have thrived in the nation's distinct communities over many centuries. This cultural and religious diversity is something that, historically, the Indonesian people have taken great pride in.

Indonesia's national symbol is Unity in Diversity. Our founding fathers conceived this unifying theme in 1945 to symbolize a newly independent, multiethnic society spread over a large geographical area that

had a history of more than three hundred years of colonization. As a multiethnic society with a colonial past, nation building became a priority for Indonesia. This goal presented a political as well as a social challenge because it was in essence changing the experience of subordination (by the colonial powers) into more equal social relationships among the various members of society. The national symbol Unity in Diversity became the vehicle to achieve that goal. This choice of symbols implies that, on a macro level, the achievement of peace cannot be dissociated from overcoming political and social relations of domination and subordination, of the superiority of one major ethnic group over the other. Attaining peace and peacebuilding is essentially the elimination of unjust relationships. Peacebuilding in this context is developing trust in "the other" within the context of equality. From a psychological perspective, real peace thrives on mutual trust: it is not the absence of open conflicts, but the presence of policies, concrete activities, commissions, peace accords, reports or other efforts that create mutual trust and feelings of justice in the parties involved. Peace is therefore also the absence of dominance over "the other" and the presence of trust in "the other." In the struggle for peace building these criteria raise the level of complexity in a multicultural society in transition.

Indonesia: A Multicultural Society in Transition

Indonesia's history since Independence (1945) has not been free from periods of violence, spurred by religious or ethnic sentiments. It also has a history of suppressing violence with military force.

The change from an authoritarian regime backed by a powerful military into a more democratic system in 1998 is referred to by many as Indonesia's period of transition. It is in this historical transition that Indonesia began experiencing widespread armed conflict in several regions simultaneously, including Aceh, Papua, Maluku, West Kalimantan, and Central Sulawesi, causing misery to thousands and perhaps millions of our compatriots (See Map). Thousands have lost their lives and more than one million now live as displaced persons, most of them women and children. The problem of displaced persons is a new phenomenon in Indonesia. While some areas, such as Aceh and Papua – and East Timor prior to the recent UN-sponsored referendum – have experienced

violent conflicts at the hands of the military for more than a decade, the level of violence reached a new high following the May 1998 fall of the authoritarian leader President Soeharto.

In addition to the multicultural aspects of Indonesian society, the current religious and ethnic violence demonstrates how religious and ethnic identities can be politicized, making peacebuilding efforts an even more complex struggle. Poverty and unequal access to resources, an unaccountable state bureaucracy, and a weak judiciary also prolong these conflicts.

Peacebuilding: Two Approaches

Two qualitatively different approaches to peacebuilding can be identified, both of which recognize the complexity of peacebuilding.

A Macro-level, Top-down Approach

One approach to peacebuilding starts at a macro level. Peacebuilding efforts have a national agenda in which high level government and military officials are the initiators and actively involve themselves in peace efforts. An example is the dialogue among representatives of the central government, including military personnel, who through negotiations with the leaders in the conflict torn provinces are trying to find solutions agreeable to the parties involved. Such dialogues were held in two provinces in our archipelago, Aceh and Papua.

In Aceh (the most western province in Indonesia) and Papua (the most eastern province), the armed conflicts are between the Indonesian security forces and those suspected to be "rebel armies." To control the rebellion, these two provinces have been designated as "military zones" for more than a decade. Several peace conferences have been held in Geneva, Switzerland to seek a solution for the province of Aceh. These conferences were sponsored by the UN Human Rights Commission with representatives from Aceh and the central government. These events also serve as an example of how international pressure is utilized to find a peaceful solution for ongoing conflicts in Indonesia.

In Maluku, the communal conflict is more along religious and ethnic lines. It is between neighboring communities of different ethnicity and/or religion who previously lived side by side peacefully. In this province,

the military is positioned to set the groundwork for peace. In reality they are not always preventing the bloody battles, and are even suspected as the instigators and perpetrators of the ongoing conflict. Lately, the central government changed its policy to reduce the conflict. Peace negotiations called *Malino I* and *II* were held with the Indonesian Minister for Social Welfare as the main initiator. He has the responsibility to halt the conflict and find peaceful solutions for this province.

Both of these peace efforts were mainly government sponsored, although conflicting parties were invited to join. Many observers consider this a top down approach that has failed to produce the peace desired by the people living in the conflict areas. It is an example of achieving negative peace because it primarily aims at halting the violence, often armed conflicts, albeit only temporarily. Since the conflicts are still going on, the efforts are also looked upon with skepticism by some observers as well as by some of the victims because it has not yet reduced their misery at the grass roots level.

A Micro-level, Bottom-up Approach

The second approach to peacebuilding emanates from civil society groups, men and women, usually known as human rights defenders. Their agenda for peacebuilding is focused on the protection and promotion of human rights by creating awareness about unjust actions experienced by members of society in general. As human rights defenders, their focus is to defend those who are victimized by the existing power holders. The victims can be workers unjustly treated by their employers, the urban poor who become victims of forced evictions by the provincial government, or journalists who are beaten by the military or the police, as well social and political activists detained by the police or families of kidnap victims. In their work as human rights defenders they lobby and negotiate with power holders, they mediate with the victims to find a solution that meets their needs for justice, and if necessary they find temporary shelters for victims of abuse. They also provide assistance to victims who need to obtain legal justice. The Legal Aid groups, as part of civil society, work toward breaking the cycle of impunity by making sure that perpetrators of abuse are brought to court even where the judiciary is still weak.



Figure 1. Map of Indonesia.

In accordance with their work and goals, the human rights defenders also work on legal reform. They have Proposed to parliament a new law, the Law for Witness and Victim protection. The absence of this law has left witnesses or victims of abuse, especially victims of political abuse, fearful to come forward to testify. Victims of domestic abuse, which is on rise in Indonesia, have also been reticent to come forward.

The human rights defenders have also been in the forefront to push for the ratification of related international human rights instruments. They were successful in getting the UN Convention on Torture ratified in 1998.

Although in reality the ratification of UN instruments does not automatically change the attitude or behavior of law enforcers, we should recognize it as an important step for protection of human rights and as a peacebuilding strategy. The ratification of a UN human rights instrument means a formal commitment by the government to comply with the principles contained in the human rights document. The human rights defenders are therefore an example of groups or individuals who are working toward the attainment of positive peace. If we compare this approach with the first one, it is clear that they work with qualitatively different strategies to achieve their goal. Human rights defenders are active in conflict as well as non-conflict areas.

These human rights defenders play an increasingly important role in building positive peace. Pressures from human rights defenders in national and international contexts have not been entirely without success. Our Parliament passed the new Law on Human Rights in 1999 and also has established by law an ad-hoc human rights tribunal to try cases of crimes against humanity. The ad-hoc tribunal has increased the expectation of victims of gross human rights violations that the government is committed to breaking the cycle of impunity. Victims will believe the government is serious about this commitment if they can show that they are serious in bringing to trial the perpetrators of state abuse. It is however still a dream, but we hope that it will be realized in the near future. For us in Indonesia, these are all new developments and can be categorized as building blocks towards building positive peace.

Protection of human rights requires a conducive environment. The new human rights law and the ad-hoc human rights tribunal are just a start in providing this environment. It has been our experience that presently even human rights defenders are not free from violent attacks by hostile groups in society. Recently in Jakarta, human rights defenders were attacked by a group that calls itself *Forum Betawi Rempug* (a forum of some indigenous citizens of Jakarta). *Forum Betawi Rempug* attacked human rights defenders and the urban poor while they were reporting ongoing forced evictions to the National Commission of Human Rights. Since this incident, human rights defenders arranged dialogues with the Jakarta Police Commander to make sure that the perpetrators, who are already in police custody, will be brought to court. However, the police commitment to serious investigations of the perpetrators is also still a dream for the victims as well as for the human rights defenders. These events demonstrate the complexity of the struggle for justice and positive peace in a society in which the judiciary is still weak, law enforcement is unjust, and intermittent violence still occurs in various parts of the country.

Peacebuilding in a Multicultural Society

If we reflect on the two different approaches to peacebuilding in Indonesia as a multicultural society, what can be identified as important aspects of positive peace? Let us start with the concept of culture.

On a societal level, culture is a set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual, and emotional features of a society or a social group. It en-

compasses lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs as well as art and literature. As a psychological construct it is a set of beliefs, attitudes and values that works as a filter in perceiving the world. Culture is also at the heart of identity formation, on a national as well as a personal level.

In a multicultural society, peace is to achieve a set of humane conditions regardless of ethnicity, religion or gender in which the experiences of peacefulness are as varied as human cultures and perspectives.

Much of the violence that afflicts human society results from a lack of equality. It is injustices and inequalities that are often at the root of many tensions and feelings of distrust, and the cause of social and armed conflict. While there is a growing realization that peace is not simply the antithesis of war, the reduction and elimination of war is a goal never to be abandoned in the struggle toward the achievement of a just and lasting peace. Peace can thus be envisioned as creating specific political, economic, and social conditions that make the world more just and increase the areas of agreement among nations and peoples. It is a continuing process that is carried on by institutions; not only the United Nations, but also by governments, non-governmental organizations, women's movements, and individual citizens. Positive peace building is thus also a struggle to work for a set of humane and equitable social condition that fulfill the human need to be free from fear and want.

During or after conflicts, peacebuilding becomes a process of trust building among those who has lost trust in "the other." As a consequence, dialogues among conflicting parties should in essence aim at building mutual trust among the parties involved.

Building Trust in the Other

There are several factors that usually play a role in the loss of trust in "the other," thus creating distrust among nations, groups or individuals. At a social level this loss may take the form of unbalanced power relationships in which "the other" is considered a threat. At the national level, "the other" is considered a threat to the national security of the country and is considered an enemy that should be destroyed. The ethnic and religious conflicts, as well as the armed conflicts in various parts of Indonesia have these characteristics.

At a personal level, distrust is a consequence of negative experiences in personal relationships, stereotypes about members from a different religion or ethnic group, gender bias, or simply general distrust of others. For example, women may experience violence just because they were born female.

Trust as a psychological construct as well as a social construct is therefore related to the fulfillment of security needs. As a social construct, trust is related to national security. At both levels it should mean the fulfillment of human security. It is building a humane world where people can live in security and dignity, free from poverty and despair, a dream for many that should be enjoyed by all.

In essence human security means freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, their safety or even their lives. Safety is the hallmark of freedom from fear, and well-being is the target of freedom from want. Human development and human security are therefore two sides of the same coin, mutually reinforcing and leading to a conducive environment for each other (first meeting Human Security Network, 1999). We can therefore say that human security and positive peace, in its broadest sense, embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care, and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfill her or his potential. In a multicultural society in transition, it is our experience that the fulfillment of freedom from want and freedom from fear as interrelated building blocks of human security or building positive peace is still a real challenge.

Building Positive Peace is Building Mutual Trust

As fellow psychologists we all know that trust as a psychological construct was first introduced by Erik Erikson (1963). Erikson talks about "basic trust" as the cornerstone of a mentally healthy developing personality, or the well-being of each individual.

At a macro level, trust building is a people-centered way of thinking about peacebuilding. Nations work together and individually to combat poverty (to fulfill freedom from want) and to contribute to sustainable human development (to fulfill freedom from fear). In particular, they commit themselves to working toward the improvement of the well-being of all peoples and to promote respect for human rights. It is within

this context that peacebuilding becomes identical to trust building. Central to this thinking is to try to establish boundaries of what seems possible in human relations, on an international, regional and national level. Developing dialogues among the parties concerned is one type of boundary. The other type is involving women, who are the other half of humanity, in peace negotiations. If trust-building is an inherent part of peace building, how do we create trust in a multicultural/multiethnic society?

Trust-building for peacebuilding in a multiethnic society requires co-operation among its various ethnic/cultural groups. First of all, this process requires respect for each others' different values, traditions and religious beliefs, and working together based on these differences. It includes respect for the existing traditional rituals as well as innovations developed in the process itself.

Progress is only possible if there is tolerance for each others' differences. Thus, cultural diversity should be seen as an asset rather than a threat. In line with Erikson's concept of personality development, trust-building is a prerequisite for creating a feeling of security. This security is reflected in conflict-torn regions where women and men are working together to achieve positive peace. It is this reality that underscores the point that peacebuilding as trust-building is a necessity not only to achieve national security, but more importantly to achieve human security. It underlies the building of a society in which everyone can live free from fear and free from want.

To summarize: peacebuilding in a multicultural society is the possibility of developing mutual trust and creating human security among people regardless of race, ethnicity, religion or gender. It is a complex interaction of:

- The recognition that existing cultural diversity within society is an enriching factor to achieve Unity in Diversity
- Genuine respect for ethnic and religious differences within one's society
- Recognition that intercultural dialogue is the best guarantee for peace
- Creating a climate of mutual trust to ensure harmonious cultural interaction
- Breaking the cycle of impunity as a responsibility to restore the human dignity of victims of intercultural violence

- A realization that negative peace is just a stage in the process of achieving positive peace

Peacebuilding clearly demands the participation of men and women as equal partners.

What is the Role of Women in Peacebuilding?

Gendered Experiences of Conflict

Both men and women can live in fear of becoming victims of violence by criminals and unjust governments. Both can also become victims of structural violence when as human beings they are impeded by poverty or other types of discrimination and deprivation. However, men and women also have different experiences of violence. Men are more likely to experience the direct violence of armed combat. Some women experience violence in the same way, but in addition they also are victimized by forms of violence peculiar to women's experience: from being helpless to save their loved ones from the violence of armed conflict; and from the pain engendered by economic structures that impose cruel deprivations. These situations cannot be dissociated from the fact that prevailing social values identify women as responsible for the well-being of the family. They suffer as well from caring deeply about the plight of all who fall victim to disasters inflicted by social conflicts.

Data collected by female human rights defenders and humanitarian workers show that during conflicts, women are killed or lose their homes, loved ones and relatives. They are often accused of supporting "the enemy," of holding strategic information, or of having witnessed human rights violations, all of which place them in peril of becoming targets of kidnapping, murder, and various types of torture. Women are victims of widespread violence of sexual abuse and rape, often during nighttime raids of rural homes in an attempt to intimidate the community in search for husbands or men considered to be members of the rebellious group. In camps for displaced persons, the perpetrators are men in general. They can be friends of the victims' husbands, members of community youth groups, as well as members of the military. Women are often the victims of racially motivated assaults, as is the case during the attack in Abepura, Papua.

Women's Perception of Peace

Women's perceptions of peace present a view from the other half of humanity. This view has been formally articulated since the United Nations International Women's Decade (1975-1985). The decade resulted in the development of an outline of a comprehensive view on peace and was the essential channel and institutional mechanism for the realization of the social aspirations of the human family based on gender equality. It adhered to the principle of non-discrimination as an important aspect of the rights-based approach. The 1979 adoption of the UN instrument on The Elimination of All Types of Discrimination, until now the only gendered international instrument, was a milestone in its global recognition that women's rights are human rights. A related UN instrument acknowledged that peace and development require the full and equal participation of women in civil and political affairs.

The Women's Decade underscored this relationship by stating that: "the full and effective promotion of women's rights can best occur in conditions of international peace and security." Through the theme "Equality, Development and Peace," women formulated and promoted alternatives to resistance to war, struggled for social justice and human rights, and strove for social conditions in which people can live free from fear and free from want. In the past, women's perceptions of peace were given little or no attention in policy making but recent research is more likely to examine gender differences. The "Peace Tent" at the 1985 Nairobi Conference on Women allowed women from all over the world to exchange ideas on peace issues and has set in motion means of collaborating that still have a profound influence on women's peace movements. Since then women all over the globe have developed their own agendas for building peace according to the specific issues they are facing in their individual countries and cultural environments.

We have now learned that the roles women play in peacebuilding are defined by their perceptions of conflict in general. Men view conflicts as a "struggle or war" which must be won despite casualties. Women on the other hand view conflict as a necessary evil in communities. When husbands or sons are killed not only do women have to bear the pain of losing a child or a husband, but they are often not able to grieve because they have to take care of their surviving children. In many cases women as victims of violence have to assume responsibilities as head of the

family without any means of income. They are required to care for the physically and emotionally injured, and tend to the rehabilitation of their homes as well as their own lives. Therefore, it is not surprising that women tend to focus on the cessation of violence.

Conflict can leave a legacy of bitter social and ethnic divisions among members of society, such as was experienced by women in Aceh, Maluku, Papua and other conflict areas where women and children were often the primary victims of violence. But many women have challenged their role as victims, playing an invaluable part in peace making and reconstruction of their families and their communities.

Women as Active Participants in Peacebuilding

Women must make a determined decision to overcome the social, religious and political obstacles that hinder their public activities. The women of Aceh made such a decision at the first All Aceh Women's Congress (2000), which was attended by about 500 Acehnese women leaders. They participated in a personal capacity as well as representing social and religious organizations from all over Aceh. As women they were determined to end the ongoing conflict in Aceh. Almost every family in that region has lost a brother, husband, father, uncle, or other relatives. Many of Acehnese women and girls were victims of gender based violence.

An outcome of this congress was an unprecedented blueprint of how women want to work together to find solutions for peace. Participants also formed an institution called *Balai Inong Aceh* composed of three main program areas: commissions for peace, for economic assistance, and for legal assistance. Women engaged in peace activities in Aceh continue to use this collective commitment as a reference point.

In the same year, Papua women also convened the Papua Women's Congress. Using their traditional belief and value system they named their program activities "to hit forest pigs with a spear" (*memanab babi butan*). Their ultimate objective: to create well-being and peace in the heart of every Papuan woman who has suffered years of conflict and to erase the image of being "*koteka*" women (women who are still backwards). They bond together to build strength, referred to as "binding together as a broom" (*sapu lidi*). This symbol of unity was based on their perceptions that women have been separated from each other because

of the ongoing conflicts in many parts of their province. In the face of unjust treatment by the military forces, they felt that women need to "hold each other" by sharing their hopes and cooperating in non-violent activities directed toward building peace and well-being for all of them.

These two congresses brought to light the manner in which ongoing conflict brings misery to women and children and illustrated how women can initiate the search for solutions consistent with their shared values and belief systems. Women, although not yet given the recognition they deserve, are definitely at the forefront of various positive peace efforts.

Rape in the Jakarta Riots

In peace efforts the role of women humanitarian workers cannot be underestimated. This role can be demonstrated by the following example.

During the three day riot in Jakarta during May 1998, now also remembered as the "May Tragedy," it was a report by a woman from the Humanitarian Volunteers that brought to national attention the brutal rapes of more than one hundred Indonesian women and girls of Chinese descent. Her report received wide media coverage, nationally and internationally. It created disbelief that such atrocities could happen in the capital city of Indonesia. Many social and religious groups made public statements which in essence were demands for the government and the military commander in charge of security to explain what happened during those riots. But they never responded—nor did they deny the report.

In this charged political situation, a group of 22 women decided to see the President (who was just 53 days in office) to demand from him that the government condemn the riots and the accompanying rapes and make an apology to the victims and their families. In a personal dialogue with the President the report of the rapes was discussed in detail. The group needed more than three hours to convince the President that the government should condemn and apologize for the atrocities experienced by the victims and their families. At the end of the meeting the President made a live television appearance to condemn the riots and the rapes. He also consented to the women's demand that the Combined Investigation Team include an investigation of the rapes that took place during the May Tragedy. They also demanded that he established a National Commission on Violence against Women. This commission, now more commonly known

as *Komnas Perempuan*, was established in October 1998 by a presidential decree. It is an independent commission that uses the UN Declaration on Violence Against Women as a reference in its program activities. It also adheres to the agreement that violence against women is a human rights violation (1993).

Komnas Perempuan

Komnas Perempuan has been using "learning from each other and together" as a strategy to work toward peacebuilding, especially in a partnership with local women's organizations in the conflict areas as well as with neighboring countries such as Sri Lanka, Philippines, and Malaysia in which women have experience in working toward peace during ongoing conflict. South African women's experience has also become an important reference for us. *Komnas Perempuan* has used a participatory approach in developing its services for survivors of violence to make sure that it meets the existing needs and traditions adhered to by the women being assisted. We now have developed psychological services for trauma victims and community education programs jointly with the organizations at the local level. Learning together with women from these regions is an important strategy not only because of the cultural diversity in our country, but also because of the shortage of experienced professionals working on peace at the grassroots level. At a more national level, *Komnas Perempuan* is working on legal reform to give better protection to female victims of violence.

Women's Positive Peacebuilding in Indonesia

We now have ample evidence that women in Indonesia, as is the case elsewhere around the globe, are not only passive victims of violence but also play an important role in positive peacebuilding. They hold congresses, create new institutions, and perform important activities "on the ground." Some of these activities are summarized here.

In Aceh: women who are witnesses to atrocities have started documenting incidents of human rights violations. They have taken on this responsibility because men are mainly treated with suspicion as being a potential rebel.

In Maluku, Aceh and Papua: Women have developed strong networks of relationships and information sharing linking villages, cities,

and the national capital. These networks convey messages that contribute to building support systems and advocacy strategies connecting local, national, and international levels.

In Maluku: Deep felt bitterness and anger have divided Muslim and Christian communities, but women are crossing enemy lines and setting up organizations composed of members from both communities to meet their common practical needs. They have formed a solidarity movement and have brought their experiences of building peace in their divided communities to the attention of high level officials at the central government. In their efforts to end the ongoing violence and to demand accountability of its perpetrators, these same women have been building alliances to strategize together and come up with concrete steps for action, for example bringing their demands to the central government in Jakarta.

Why Are Women Absent from the Peace Negotiation Table?

Around the globe, women's active role in peace-making has not been given the needed attention in formal peace negotiations. This is a fact which should be given our combined attention as psychologists because it is in essence influenced by the worldwide belief that women's place is in the domestic sphere, not the public sphere. Psychologists should be able to contribute to changing this prejudice. Why?

By introducing women's issues as war and peace issues, concepts of peace become broader and more complex, and extend far beyond the mere absence of wars. It is a view that the possibilities for peace rest in large measure on the possibilities for women, for their full emancipation and for the realization of their vision of peace and human security.

But discrimination involving various aspects of women's lives has resulted in their experience in peacebuilding being ignored and viewed around the world as of little importance. The reality, as this chapter illustrates, is quite different. The ongoing inequality in gender relationships, in the home as well as in society, is responsible for women's inability to be recognized as stakeholders in peacebuilding efforts.

The need for recognition of women as peace builders has been the theme of the International Women's Day at the United Nations (March, 2000). On this occasion, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan specifically announced the need for the presence of women around the negotiating table. He made a call to all member countries to include women in their

negotiations for peace, at international and national levels. He believes that women's approaches to social relations and economic necessity reflect needed capacities that all humans should develop. He acknowledged that women's domestic role in accommodating differences and mediating conflicts has engendered a repertoire of skills that can be effectively applied at the community and national levels, but these skills have been ignored or rejected in the public sphere. Kofi Annan's call for the presence of women around the negotiating table is supported by the belief that women's experiences and skills as nurturers open possibilities for unprecedented policies in sustaining peace and development. It is not that women are better than men, but women can bring different experiences to the negotiating table that introduce possibilities for new policies to achieve lasting peace.

What Are the Implications for Peacebuilding in the Future?

Principles developed in psychology and by cross-cultural and cultural psychologists can contribute to global peace processes in important ways. There is a need to apply psychological concepts and analyses to conflict resolution and to raise awareness in policymakers and institution builders about psychological factors which may hamper or can strengthen the processes of peacebuilding. Based on what we know today, what can psychology as a science offer to make positive peace a reality for people living in conflict areas? Here are some questions that we can ponder:

- By recognizing that the root causes of conflict are unfulfilled or threatened human needs (such as the psychological need to be free from fear and free from want, the need for justice, dignity and recognition), how can psychologists contribute to the process and what are the critical and practical psychological principles that can be applied in the field of conflict resolution and peacebuilding?
- Since the process of peacebuilding also requires humanizing the other persons or communities whose purpose in life has been humiliated or destroyed, trust-building becomes very important. How can psychologists make policymakers aware of the importance of developing the kind of mutual trust needed for peace building on a macro level?

- One of the main obstacles to Kofi Annan's call that more women should sit around the peace negotiations table is ongoing prejudice about women's place (which is in the home) and the adherence to masculine values (men's role is in the public sphere) that continuously reinforce women's subservient place in society. What is the role of psychology in changing these cultural norms, especially as a social construct?
- What roles should psychology and/or psychologists play in peace-building efforts in general, when the reality is that we are living in a world in which the culture of violence is the dominant force?

References

- Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, New York, 8 December 1979 (2000). In *Millennium summit: Multilateral treaty framework. An invitation to universal participation* (pp. 24-27). New York: United Nations.
- Erikson, E.H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Galtung, J. (1961). Prison: The organization of dilemma. In D. Cressey (Ed.). *The prison*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- International women's day: Women uniting for peace, 8 March 2000. In *United Nations conferences and observances* (p. 15). New York: United Nations.
- Keputusan Presiden RI Nomor 181/1998 tentang Komisi Nasional Anti Kekerasan terhadap Perempuan (KOMNAS PEREMPUAN)* [Presidential decree of the Republic of Indonesia number 181/1998 on the National Commission on Violence against Women (KOMNAS PEREMPUAN)].
- Matsuura, K. (2001). *Cultural diversity. Common heritage, plural identities*. UNESCO declaration on cultural diversity, adopted by the 31st session of the UNESCO General Conference, Paris.
- Melani Budianta (n.d.). *Women's response to militaristic security. The case of Aceh women*. Retrieved December 2, 2003, from <http://www.focusweb.org/programmes/Security/Okinawa%202000/Melani.htm>

- Undang-undang RI Nomor 39/1999 tentang Hak Azasi Manusia* [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 39/1999 on Human Rights]. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- UN-NGLS (1985). *The United Nations decade for women (1976-1985). A decade of development*. New York: UN-NGLS.
- United Nations Department of Public Information (1986). *The Nairobi forward-looking strategies for the advancement of women as adopted by the World Conference to review and appraise the achievements of the United Nations decade for women: Equality, development and peace, Nairobi, Kenya, 15-26 July, 1985*. New York: Author.
- United Nations (1993). *World conference on human rights. The Vienna declaration and programme of action, June 1993*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (1994). *Declaration of the elimination of violence against women* (A/RES/48/104, 20 December 1993). New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (1996). *Convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*. Bangkok: Student Christian Centre.
- Women's empowerment in the context of human security* (1999). Bangkok: ESCAP.