As the final activity of the extended project on developing National Collective Violence for Early Warning (CVEW) Dataset, CSIS organised a public seminar on 20 February 2023 to share the updated version of the Dataset. More than 70 participants attended the seminar, where 42 attended physically while 30 participants via online.

Compared to the initial version, the current format has been upgraded as the CSIS team has increased the number verified newspaper sources from 75 to 93, which enables the Dataset to cover more comprehensive collective violence cases across Indonesia.

The seminar began with the welcome remarks from Dr Shafiah Muhibat, the Deputy Executive Director for Research, followed by the presentation by Mr Alif Satria, the main researcher in charge to develop the instruments of the Dataset. Two prominent discussants were invited to provide insights, namely Mr Anug Kurniawan, the Head of the Sub-Directorate for Conflict Management, Directorate for National Awareness from the Ministry of Home Affairs and Mr Wahyu Cahyono, researcher from Laboratorium for Political Psychology, University of Indonesia. The discussion was moderated by Dr Lina Alexandra, the Head of Department of International Relations, CSIS.

**General findings**

Generally, the Database recorded 1,116 cases in 2022, which is 8.7% lower than 2021 figures. However, the lethality level has increased 54% as the number of injured and deaths soared from 1,405 to 2,174 victims. Similar to 2021, there was an increasing trend starting from the beginning toward the end year. In November 2022, there was a significant spike in two provinces, namely South Sulawesi and Papua, which counts for 50% of total monthly average.

While, the highest number of collective violence was found in East Java with 221 cases. Nonetheless, it is also important to underline that there was an outlier case, specifically the mishandling case by the police against potential soccer supporters’ brawl in East Java which recorded more than 700 deaths.

In terms of geographical spread, high intensity of collective violence (number of incidence per 1 million population) occur mostly in eastern part of the country, such as in Moluccas (20 cases), Papua (19.9), and West Papua (16.7). In total, the intensity of collective violence in the three provinces is approximately 4.5 higher than the national average.

From the Dataset, we can learn that the most prevalent type of collective violence in 2022 is vigilantism, while the second and third ranks are occupied by criminal cases and identity-based violence, which interestingly not necessarily related to ethnic or religious sentiments, but rather by “school” identity (student brawls).

**Specific findings**

There are two specific findings to highlight in the Dataset. Firstly, on intervention. Regarding the effort to stop the violence, similar to 2021, the level of intervention by third party to stop the violence is still relatively low, which is less than 25% of total cases. In terms of its effectiveness, the percentage is also decreasing from 74.4% in 2021 to 56.1 %.

The Database also reveals that in 2022, intervention by non-state actors tend to be relatively more successful (57%) than conducted by state actors (50.5%). Interestingly, if both actors intervene, the level of effectiveness reaches 100%.

Secondly, specific finding on Papua. While the collective violence related to separatist war relatively decreased for about 25% from the figure in 2021, there has been worrying trend due to significant surge of attacks against civilians and private companies from 36% in 2021 to 43% in 2022. Moreover, the geographical spread of separatist violence incidence also increased. In 2021, most of the cases occurred in 8 cities/towns while in 2022 became doubled.
Discussion

In comparison, Mr Anug Kurniawan from the Ministry of Home Affairs shared about his institution’s work to record violence cases but only those defined as social conflict in accordance to Act Number 7/2012 on Social Conflict Management. The Secretariat for Integrated Team for Social Conflict Management was established to be in charge with receiving reports from local governments as well updates from social media. The data is being analysed to help crafting government policies to deal with social conflicts. To smoothen the reporting process by the local government, the Home Affairs Ministry has created the so-called Social Conflict Management Information System.

Nonetheless, Mr Kurniawan reveals that the database does not record violence cases that were taking place inside certain institution, such as within campus, as the source of conflict is often unclear and not necessarily fulfils the criteria of social conflict mentioned in the Act 7/2012.

Mr Wahyu Cahyono from University of Indonesia shared that his institution is currently revitilising the Violence Prevention National System (Sistem Nasional Pencegahan Kekerasan/ SNPK) starting from early 2022 based on the request from the Coordinating Ministry for Human Development and Cultural Affairs. Compared to the CVEW developed by CSIS, the revitalised SNPK includes other categories, such as violence extremism, sexual violence, hate speech and bullying cases. Similar to CVEW, SNPK also relies on verified media sources.

Mr Cahyono underlines similar challenge in differentiating whether one incidence can be categorised as violence data to be recorded. He also emphasised the importance to sustain the speed in updating the data to ensure its credibility since some online media often take out the news in a short time. Moreover, the sustainability of database which enables it to secure a longitudinal data would be very valuable to analyse violence trend.

From the audience, there are several important inputs to note. First, there is a suggestion for CVEW database to record gender-based violence or collective violence against women, such as forceful campaign for Muslim women to wear hijab and violence against female domestic workers. The input is well-taken; however, the database has its limitation as most of newspaper sources often do not record the victim’s gender.

Second, there is a suggestion to underline that the definition of “intervention” in the Dataset only refers to the act to stop the violence, rather than dealing with the causes.

Third, there was a discussion regarding intention as variable to define whether certain violence can be included or not in the Dataset. Again, it reveals the limitation of the data source as news reporting often do not clearly record the existence of intention from the perpetrator at the first place. Nonetheless, the CVEW, based on the initial review process, is to record all types of collective violence which involves a group of people and act or threat to do violence against the other, which may or may not reveal certain intention of the perpetrator.

To conclude, the dynamic discussion indicates that there has been a great appreciation and tremendous support to CSIS for creating CVEW Database, followed with high expectation that such Dataset can continue in the future. There is also suggestions from the stakeholders for CSIS to synergize with similar initiatives developed by various ministries, such as the SNPK which is currently managed by the Laboratory for Political Psychology in the University of Indonesia based on the endorsement from the Coordinating Ministry for Human Development and Cultural Affairs.

It is also important to note, as published by several media in Indonesia after the Seminar, that the Chair of the Indonesian People’s Consultative Assembly (MPR-RI) Bambang Soesatyo has specifically referred to the CVEW Dataset to suggest the government to anticipate potentials toward collective violence during the election time.

In essence, the synergy of the existing database on collective violence and conflict, including developed by CSIS, are extremely useful to be used by the Indonesian government as well as other stakeholders to assist in better policies and management to prevent them for being escalated into a large-scale atrocities in the future.