

Discontent and Distrust of Indigenous Papuans in Papua's Special Autonomy Policy

Dr. Krinus Kum, M.Si., M.AP

Email address: nemtaroa(at)gmail.com, jamallatif17(at)gmail.com

Abstract— *The aspirations of the indigenous Papuan people that have been submitted to the center are then responded well by the central government, very precise and targeted according to the conditions and conditions that occur in Papua. But the law issued by the central government at that time, the Papuans did not accept and did not maintain it properly, even though the purpose was very clear that with the presence of this law the Papuan people could regulate, run and manage their own natural resources, accelerate development, reduce conflict and so on. However, during the special autonomy period, the Papuan people have never felt satisfaction, joy, happiness and so on. However, what happens in the life of the Papuan people is distrust, dissatisfaction, and feeling of injustice towards the application of the law faced by the people in the era of special autonomy.*

Keywords— *Policy, special autonomy, discontent and distrust.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The central government issued law number 21 of 2001 on special autonomy for the provinces of Papua and West Papua. In the provisions of this law, special autonomy is a special authority recognized and granted to the Papua Province to regulate and manage the interests of the local community according to its own initiative based on the aspirations and basic rights of the Papuan people. In addition, there are several purposes that serve as the basis for issuing or issuing these laws, among which are to accelerate and facilitate development, referring to the welfare of the community, reducing conflicts that are heating up or prolonged conflicts and so on.

However, the indigenous Papuan people, understanding and studying more deeply about the twelve years of special autonomy have been running, it turns out that they did not answer at all as the original purpose of the law, so that the indigenous Papuans were disappointed with the central government, so the results are as they are today. or not in accordance with the wishes of the Papuan people. But what happens in the life of the Papuan people is that the people experience mutual distrust, dissatisfaction, injustice, discrimination, have different views and perceptions between the Papuan people themselves, are not ready for human resources, then experience or face serious violations of human rights in Papua. the land of Papua, so that it is difficult for the Papuan people to live in peace, harmony and harmony.

As a result of the birth of the special autonomy law, causing events related to politics, people have distrust of the birth of the special autonomy. Some political events, for example, the division of Provinces and Regency/City areas, the general election of regional heads in Papua which led to prolonged conflict and then claimed lives. The protracted human rights violations in Papua never end even though the main purpose of the birth of the special autonomy law has been very clearly stated that it will reduce the protracted conflict in Papua, but on the contrary, it will increase conflict and human rights violations. With the spirit of special autonomy, it also often causes conflicts in the election of regional heads and deputy regional heads, even the division of Provinces and

Regency/City areas, for example Central Irian Jaya Province (now Central Papua), Puncak Regency, Tolikara Regency, conflicts over the expansion of the Nduga District issue, and other areas throughout Papua.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

Based on some of the problems that we have raised, this research uses a descriptive qualitative approach. In this study, researchers used descriptive research methods, namely trying to find an understanding of meaning based on facts or facts that occurred in Papua Province and West Papua Province, related to the implementation of special autonomy in Papua and then conducted a study in order to obtain a clear and systematic picture in order to find solutions. or a solution to the problem at hand. Then accelerate development and reduce any prolonged conflicts in Papua.

In writing this book, the author tries to collect data from various sources; including the author conducting interviews with students and indigenous Papuans, participating in live broadcasts in public discussions with Papuan leaders, literature books, reports, results of previous research, statements, laws, government regulations. , decisions, print and electronic media, experiences of seeing, hearing and feeling and other sources, related to the implementation of special autonomy in the provinces of Papua and West Papua.

Collecting data through two sources, namely primary sources and secondary sources. One approach to collecting data through primary sources is that the author conducts direct interviews with students and indigenous Papuans, relating to the implementation of Papua's special autonomy, taking place from 2002 to 2020. Meanwhile, secondary data is not collected directly, but intermediaries or data collected already available. For example, the results of previous research, books, reports, articles, official regulations from the government and so on (Kum, 2015: 14).

III. DISCUSSION

1. Distrust

Indigenous Papuan people who are experiencing an attitude of distrust towards the implementation of special autonomy in

Papua. Especially for those who play an important role in the implementation of the special autonomy. In this case, it is the Papuan leaders who are controlling and implementing the special autonomy law. The public is also aware that large sums of funds are launched annually from the central government to the regional governments of Papua Province and West Papua Province. However, the results have not been felt by the indigenous Papuans. So that there are no significant or fundamental changes experienced by the Papuan people, both in the growth of the populist economy and community independence in relation to the development of the village economy towards the middle to upper middle economy.

The distrust of indigenous Papuans is not only in local Papuan leaders who carry out policies, but also the central government which issues the special autonomy law. The community also considers that every policy issued is not the goal of community welfare and reduces every conflict and even reduces any prolonged human rights violations in Papua. However, indigenous Papuans understand and learn about the central government issuing the special autonomy law. Then the Papuan people believe that the central government issued the special autonomy law not for the purpose of accelerating development and reducing conflict, but for the sole purpose of politics. So that there is distrust between the Papuan people and the central government. This is because there are still human rights violations and intimidation of the Papuan people. This is what causes deep disappointment so that they (the Papuan people) choose the alternative to leave the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

On the other hand, if it is seen from the main objective of the issuance of the special autonomy law, that with the issuance of this law, it can reduce any prolonged conflicts in Papua, but in reality it escalates and prolongs conflicts. So that the Papuan people confuse themselves, then start with the basic question that Is the main purpose of issuing a special autonomy law, indeed, to reduce longstanding conflicts in Papua? Or is it the other way around to increase the protracted conflict? In connection with the question above, the central government and regional governments must conduct an in-depth evaluation, so that the implementation of this law goes according to its original purpose, which is stated in the law.

Some of the substances in the special autonomy law actually lead to unresolved conflicts between the Papuan people and the government, such as the issue of regional symbols and flags. Although the existence of symbols and flags is recognized in Article 2 paragraph (2) of Law number 21 of 2001 which reads that Papua Province can have regional symbols as a banner of greatness and cultural symbols for the splendor of Papuan identity in the form of regional flags and regional anthems that are not positioned as a symbol of sovereignty. However, it did not get a further formulation and was actually blocked by the government. The case of raising the Morning Star flag is a common example. The Indonesian National Armed Forces and the Indonesian National Police refused to fly the Morning Star flag.

In its implementation, the political dimension in problem solving is much stronger than development and increasing welfare, and increasing economic growth. Special autonomy is

mostly filled with political events such as expansion, demonstrations, the return of special autonomy, to regional head elections. There is very little space available for concrete programs to improve the standard of living of the Papuan people in order to close the gap between the center and Papua, between other regions and Papua, even between indigenous Papuans and migrants.

According to Neles Tebay, explaining about every problem that often occurs in Papua, at the end of March hundreds of Papuans demonstrated in the courtyard of the Papua Governor's Office. Their aspirations are to reject the Papuan special autonomy policy that has been in place since 2001. This action is just one indication of a problem that demands a comprehensive solution. The fundamental problem that has not been resolved since Papua was integrated into the Republic of Indonesia in 1963 is the distrust between the central government and indigenous Papuans. The rejection of the special autonomy policy is an expression of the Papuan people's distrust of the central government. This problem of distrust has been around for a long time and is still interfering with development in Papua. Thus, building trust between the government and indigenous Papuans is a basic and urgent need.

Papuans see the government as a liar. The government says one thing, but does another. As a result, Papuans do not trust the government, which is considered to be lying. The government stipulates many special laws and regulations for Papua, issues various development policies, and makes development promises. However, Papuans see that the government is inconsistent in implementing everything.

The government's inconsistency is evident in its implementation of Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Papua Province. The government, for example, set a policy on the division of Papua Province into three provinces through Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 2003 without consulting the local government and the Papuan people. The government also forced the formation of West Papua Province by amending the Papua Special Autonomy Law without heeding Article 76 which gave the Papuan people the authority to amend the Law.

The government rejected the Papuan people's proposal about cultural symbols through Government Regulation No. 77 of 2007 concerning the prohibition of separatist flags being used as cultural flags. The government also enacted two laws at the same time, namely Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua and Law Number 32/2004. The rejection of the request for judicial review by the Constitutional Court regarding the change in the voters for the governor and deputy governor of Papua is seen as another example of the government's inconsistency in the Papua Special Autonomy Law. According to the Papua Special Autonomy Law, the governor and deputy governor should be elected by the Papuan People's Representative Council, but the government stipulates that the election is conducted directly by the people. Papuans believe that the government's lack of seriousness will continue because the government has not shown its intention to evaluate the implementation of Papua's special autonomy. If the law is not implemented consistently, Papuans believe that all the laws and regulations under it will not be implemented by the

government. As a result, Papuan people's distrust of the government is increasing. All good intentions of the government to develop Papuans will be rejected before it becomes a new lie.

On the other hand, the government also does not trust Papuans. This can be seen in the government's excessive suspicion of Papuans. Even though it has been 48 years since joining the Republic of Indonesia, the government seems to treat Papuans not as citizens whose existence should be protected, but as separatists who must be wary of for the sake of upholding the integrity of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, the government financed the Indonesian National Army to carry out a series of military operations to eradicate separatists who incidentally were Papuans.

In addition to military operations, the government also applies a separatist stigma. This stigma prevents Papuans from developing careers in politics and government. Officials, members of the Papuan People's Representative Council and Papuan People's Assembly, as well as figures who critically voice the alignment, protection, and empowerment of Papuans are always suspected of being separatists. Such suspicions still apply and are felt by Papuans to this day. As a result, no matter how good the idea of development put forward by the Papuans, the government often rejects it.

This mistrust resulted in a breakdown in communication between the government and the Papuans. The government and Papuans each talk about the other, but never talk to each other. This gulf is getting wider day by day. So, the problem of distrust must be addressed jointly by the government and the Papuan people through peaceful dialogue. Therefore, dialogue between the central government (Jakarta) and Papuans can be the main means of building this trust. Both the government and Papuans need to elect representatives so that they can prepare together the basic principles, stages, mechanisms, agendas, and other matters relating to the Jakarta-Papua dialogue (Kompas, 9 April 2011).

2. Dissatisfaction

Apart from the distrust of indigenous Papuans, they are also dissatisfied with the central government's policy of issuing a special autonomy law, which is further implemented by the regional governments of Papua and West Papua Provinces. The community is always dissatisfied with the system for implementing the special autonomy law, which has reached the age of twelve and a half years. However, the construction is not yet visible, even though the special autonomy fund which is launched every year is quite large in the trillions. The community feels a little about the program from the governor of Papua Province, for village development.

Village Development Strategic Plan Program, by budgeting 100,000,000 villages; (one hundred million). The management of this fund is also not pleasing to the people, especially the small community in the village, because they admit that it is the negligence of the people in the field who have been entrusted with it. The transfer of funds never reached the village in its entirety, due to the lack of strict supervision by the local government itself. The funds are also not available to all

villages, those who are entitled to receive these funds are villages that really need it according to the regional government, as stated by the governor of Papua. By looking at these facts, the community raises an attitude of dissatisfaction with every development plan carried out by the regional government which is managed in the special autonomy fund. Although on the other hand and in other places, it has been successful in managing special autonomy funds, the community sees on the other side or sees that development has not been running optimally. This is where the dissatisfaction with the management of the special autonomy funds emerges.

In their book, Ali Safa'at et al., explain that of the two regions that have special autonomy, Aceh can be said to have succeeded, but this is not the case with Papua. Aceh has been able to minimize conflict and armed violence and run the wheels of local government well, although there are still small ripples of violence. This is different from Papua, which is still subject to armed conflict and violence often occurs.

Of course there are many factors that influence the differences in the two areas. However, the two most prominent factors are conflict resolution and the implementation of special autonomy. The basic difference between Aceh and Papua is in terms of conflict resolution. In Aceh, the political conflict of secession was resolved before the implementation of special autonomy which was implemented in Aceh. It was the product of the mutual agreement of the parties involved in the conflict so that its implementation was understood together as a form of follow-up to conflict resolution.

This is different from what happened in Papua. Papua's special autonomy cannot be said to be a form of mutual agreement, but a product of the central government to reduce conflicts that occur in Papua. If Aceh's special autonomy is a follow-up form of conflict resolution, Papuan autonomy is made as an effort to resolve the conflict. As a result, there is no common understanding of the parties involved in the conflict regarding the existence of special autonomy. For the central government, special autonomy is a tangible manifestation of efforts to resolve conflicts, while for some Papuans special autonomy is the creation of the central government to stop their resistance.

Regarding special autonomy, there are indeed Papuan people who are involved in its formation and accept it as the best way for the realization of peace in Papua. Likewise, in terms of substance, the Papuan special autonomy law has indeed given a larger portion to the Papuan people. However, this turned into part of the source of the conflict when the Papua Special Autonomy Law was not implemented consistently. The rights, powers and obligations given to Papua are often limited, reduced or even withdrawn to the center through various operational and sectoral laws and regulations (Ali Safa'at et al., 2012: 40-42).

According to the Bishop of Timika, Mgr Jahn Philip Saklil, stated that a number of parties considered that the weakness of the local government in carrying out the wheels of government resulted in turmoil in the community, due to dissatisfaction that did not find a way out. For example, the attack by armed civilian groups that resulted in the death of 4 civilians and 8 members of the Indonesian National Army in Sinak District, Puncak

Regency and Tinggimambut District, Puncak Jaya Regency, occurred on February 21, 2013. He admits that he is concerned that every problem in Papua must end in violence, even with the loss of life. According to John, local government figures should play an important role in mediating all community aspirations. However, in reality, the government is negligent, so that people have to deal with the authorities. It's no surprise that the citizens act in military ways.

In Papua, almost every problem experienced by residents, whether with companies or due to government negligence, will be faced with the authorities, so that we are in a situation of war. Many areas in the interior of Papua are isolated, there are only army or police posts. Meanwhile, village or district/sub-district officials were never present. So that the army or police, that is the sub-district head, becomes the village head. It is not surprising that if there is a problem, the residents directly deal with the authorities. John Saklil hopes that the incident that took place last week can be thoroughly investigated, and can find the root of the problem so that it can be resolved humanely. He is worried that if the case is not resolved, similar incidents will continue to occur.

According to constitutional law expert, Yusril Ihza Mahendra, the protracted conflict in Papua is due to the dissatisfaction of a group of citizens that the state has never fully resolved. He also reminded government officials to remain cool-headed and calm in solving the Papuan problem. The approach must be effective so that the situation does not get worse. As the former Minister of State Secretary in the 2004-2009 period, Yusril shared that, just like what happened in other parts of the world, the problems in Papua were triggered because not everyone was satisfied with everything that existed. Some people in Papua are not satisfied and comfortable if the area is under the auspices of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. But, after all the process of integration of Papua with Indonesia is historical and does happen. Internationally, this has happened and has been recognized.

It must be admitted that the previous government did not pay special attention to the social and economic fields to the people there, so they were indeed far behind compared to people in other regions. Now it's actually better with the special autonomy policy there. However, the shootings of the Indonesian National Army and civilians have become a lesson that Papua's special autonomy has not yet been satisfactory. Must be wise to find a solution. He assessed that several working groups formed by the government, such as the Papua Desk at the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs and the Unit for the Acceleration of Development for the Provinces of Papua and West Papua, were still ineffective. According to Yusril, one important solution is to create a ministry-level institution whose task is to focus on Papua. Or it could also take advantage of existing ministries to carry out this function. I personally see, there is a Ministry of Disadvantaged Regions. They should have been made to play more roles by focusing on areas such as Aceh, Papua, and others.

IV. CLOSING

In fact, the aspirations of the indigenous Papuan people that have been submitted to the center are then responded well by

the central government, very precise and targeted according to the conditions and conditions that occur in Papua. But the law issued by the central government at that time, the Papuans did not accept and did not maintain it properly, even though the purpose was very clear that with the presence of this law the Papuan people could regulate, run and manage their own natural resources, accelerate development, reduce conflict and so on. However, during the special autonomy period, the Papuan people have never felt satisfaction, joy, happiness and so on. However, what happened in the life of the Papuan people was distrust, dissatisfaction, and feeling of injustice towards the application of the law faced by the people in the era of special autonomy, so that in carrying out demonstrations everywhere and in other places, indigenous Papuans said that "they must return special autonomy or special autonomy has failed". If we analyze more deeply about this statement, it is actually a statement by the people who are experiencing disappointment over the implementation of special autonomy which is not in line with the expectations of the indigenous Papuan people. In this regard, the community considers that the purpose of special autonomy is very different from its implementation. Even more ironically, indigenous Papuans always face violence and human rights violations.

Every year the Central Government allocates a special autonomy fund which is quite large in value. However, the majority of indigenous Papuan people who admit that they have not enjoyed or have not touched the small community or lower-level communities, always say that they are not satisfied with the results of the implementation of special autonomy itself. In addition, the indigenous Papuan people view and assess that the implementation of special autonomy has not brought significant results, because the people really feel distrust, dissatisfaction, injustice, and feel discriminated against by the central government and local governments. So by looking at these conditions, the people say that special autonomy and development in Papua have failed.

REFERENCES

1. Ali Safa'at Muchamad et al. 2012. Oasis of Peaceful Papuan Ideas, Jakarta: Imparsial
2. Kum, Krinus. 2015. Papua Special Autonomy Development Implementation Policy Between Failure and Success, Yogyakarta: Litera Book
3. Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua Province