

Failure in the Implementation of Special Autonomy and Development in Papua

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

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

Abstract— *Special Autonomy for Papua has lasted 19 years 2001-2020. However, its implementation has not been able to bring about significant changes and progress for all Papuan people, especially the Papuan people. Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Papua Province regulates the points that must be considered by state administrators (central government in Jakarta and regional governments in Papua) so that community members and Indigenous Papuans experience changes for the better. However, after eleven years of implementation, special autonomy is like toothless, without the ability to break the deadlock in the suffering of the people and especially the indigenous Papuans. With the presence of special autonomy in Papua Province, the Papuan people have never felt satisfaction, joy 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 that is faced in the era of special autonomy, so that in carrying out demonstrations everywhere to reject special autonomy, in that demand the indigenous Papuan people say that " must restore special autonomy or special autonomy has failed". Indigenous Papuans also say that special autonomy has failed, due to strengthening for several reasons during the twelve years of implementation of special autonomy, they do not see fundamental changes or significant changes in development, especially the development of education, health and people's economic growth for the progress and independence of the community. Papuan native.*

Keywords— *Implementation, special autonomy failure, and development.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Provinces of Papua and West Papua Provinces. These laws were issued since the reign of President Megawati Soekarno Putri, as well as several regulations issued since the administration of President SBY, both volume I and volume II. In connection with several regulations that have been issued for the progress of the Papua Province and West Papua Province, in addition to Law Number 21 of 2001. Also issued Law Number 45 of 1999 concerning the division of Central Irian Jaya Province and West Irian Jaya Province and Paniai Regency, Mimika Regency, Puncak Jaya Regency and Sorong City, Presidential Regulation Number 65 of 2011 and Presidential Regulation Number 66 of 2011 concerning UP4B, Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2003 concerning the Implementation and Acceleration of Expansion in Papua and other regulations, both at the level of Law Invite or below. All regulations that have been issued by the central government are a positive goal in the context of accelerating development in Papua. However, there is a misperception between the central government and local governments as well as the indigenous Papuan people, so that development in Papua does not run effectively and efficiently.

Since the birth of the above-mentioned regulations to this day, among the indigenous Papuan people, academics, researchers and other elements, often sentences that are considered as failures of development or failure of the implementation of Papua's special autonomy, namely mutual distrust, mutual discontent, injustice, discrimination, marginalization, unequal perceptions, mutual disinterest, and others. These things are indications of the failure of development and implementation of special autonomy in Papua. All elements of society in Papua, have studied and also understand their experiences. Then it is said that the

development failure is because the local government does not yet have a good development concept and creates more dependence, for example regional development in Mimika Regency is more dependent on Freeport. As with economic growth and development, in theory, new developing countries usually depend a lot on developed countries.

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. Failure in the Implementation of Special Autonomy for Papua

Although the new law was not well received by segments of Papuan society who had opted for independence only, separating the people into the pros and cons of special autonomy took effect on January 1, 2002 and became the main guideline for the new government to work. Those who receive special autonomy do so even though they are still skeptical, instead of taking a wait-and-see action. In their hearts they hope for positive results and feel that new opportunities to improve the quality of life in Papua are still within reach. Special autonomy opens up new and tangible perspectives for important changes and improvements. For local people, this opens the way to experience holding power, holding rights to their own land. In this perspective, the governor formulated his main development vision for the period 2001-2005. By 2005 Papua will have a strong political, cultural, social and economic base, which will allow the Papuan people's desire to become masters of their own people to come true.

Special autonomy opens up many opportunities and if it is implemented consistently it will reduce interference by groups that already have an interest. voice over controls over human resources is very important in this perspective. Thus, during 2002-2004, the implementation of Otsus proved not to be easy and a number of factors had to be considered, such as:

1. Well-trained and informed personnel;
2. Preparation of the annual budget according to priorities as stated in the special autonomy system;
3. Be aware of real and tangible indications that can improve people's daily lives;
4. The embodiment of the special autonomy principles into legally binding and practical rules;
5. Establishment of the necessary constituent councils, particularly the Papuan People's Council (MRP), a new semi-parliamentary body representing (a) adat, (b) religion, and (c) women.

The new law and its effects still need to be socialized, especially to correct the existing view that special autonomy only involves money (an increase in the budget). This budget is not in accordance with the priorities of promises to improve the lives of citizens (education, health care and the community's economy) and the failure to fulfill government promises. Instead, the new resources that are available are spent on trips for civil servants (comparison studies everywhere), on cars for governments and dignitaries, on large-scale developments and so on. Money is issued without going through the proper oversight mechanism, opening up opportunities for non-transparent spending. In addition, the formation of a new representative council, the MRP, to which high hopes were placed, did not take place, because the President at that time was not willing to give his approval. People gradually began to feel cheated once again. This sentiment strengthened in early 2003 (Broek, 2006: 267-268).

Researcher from the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI), Siti Zuhro said that the failure of Special Autonomy in Papua and West Papua was due to the fact that the implementation of Special Autonomy was not managed directly by the Regional Government of Papua itself. The Papuan Regional Government does not carry out its duties. Thus, the implementation of the Special Autonomy funds in the education and health sectors did not run as it should. Deputy for Coordination and Synchronization of Planning and Funding for the Unit for the Acceleration of Development of the Provinces of Papua and West Papua (UP4B) M Ikhwanuddin Mawardi said the failure of Special Autonomy was also due to the weak control and supervision of the management of Special Autonomy funds by the central government, both the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Finance. National Development Planning Agency.

The West Papuan people's urge to leave the state of Indonesia has started to resonate openly since Indonesia entered the reform era in 1998. The Indonesian government granted Special Autonomy to Papua Province as a middle ground for demands for independence for West Papua. The purpose of granting Special Autonomy is so that the government has special authority to regulate itself and accelerate development from being left behind nationally. The granting of Special Autonomy has pros and cons in the life of the people of West Papua. The granting of Special Autonomy for Papua Province is not representative of the people and seems forced to accept it. Because the Special Autonomy was granted not based on a mutual agreement between the Papuan community leaders and the Central Government. This is very different from the granting of Special Autonomy for the Government of Nangro Aceh Darussalam because it is given by agreement of both parties (law.kompasiana.com, 2013).

In addition, the status of political integration into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia in the 1960s is still a controversial issue for some groups in Papua. There is a fundamental and sharp difference between the understanding of the indigenous Papuans and the understanding of the Central Government regarding the provision of a fair opportunity for self-determination in the Pepera (Principle of People's Opinion) which is regulated in various international conventions. Another thing is that the human rights violations that occurred during the New Order era still linger on the minds of every family in Papua whose family members became victims during military operations and were detained without trial for alleged involvement with separatist movements. Pressure from the security forces of the TNI and POLRI has given rise to state violence and crimes in Papua. This approach of violence and crime has cost the lives of hundreds or even thousands of Papuan civilians. The failure of the implementation of Special Autonomy in Papua is inseparable from the role of the Central Government. Their role is seen in juridical determinations that are contrary to the Special Autonomy Law, namely:

a. Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 2003 which reactivated the Provinces of West Irian Jaya and Central Irian Jaya. However, in subsequent developments, West Irian Jaya Province continues to exist until now despite rejection from the community, while Central Irian Jaya has been successfully

rejected. The existence of West Irian Jaya Province is the only province in the world that does not have a clear legal basis but is operationally running well.

b. PP No. 77 of 2007 concerning the prohibition of the Morning Star Flag and other flags which are considered symbols of separatists in Indonesia. The Central Government expressly rejects the MRP's Affirmative Action Policy regarding the proposed draft of the Morning Star Flag as a cultural symbol. The central government also rejected SK Number 14 regarding all Regional Heads in Papua Lands are Papuan natives (law.kompasiana.com, 2013).

Real conditions in Papua state that an Presidential Instruction can defeat a law, such as Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2003 concerning IJB and IJT can defeat the Papua Special Autonomy Law. Although the actual position of the Act is higher than Government Regulations, Perpu, and Presidential Instructions. Seeing the reality, this Special Autonomy can be said to have failed. Even though the allocation of distribution funds in the form of special revenue funds for the Papua Province continues to flow. Every year it continues to grow. From 2002 it was Rp. 1,382 trillion, to Rp. 1,539 trillion in 2003, then to Rp. 1,642 trillion in 2004. Theoretically, with that amount of funds, Papua could catch up with other provinces. However, what happened on the ground was completely different. In the eyes of the Papua Regional Government, Special Autonomy is seen solely as a program to disburse some money for the Papua Province. As a result, Special Autonomy became a contest for projects.

The purpose of the issuance of Presidential Instruction No. 5 of 2007 is actually a step taken by the government as a follow-up to the implementation of the Special Autonomy Law because it sees the reality of regional officials in Papua committing corruption, both echelon I, II, III officials and even honorary employees who have their own houses and cars suspected of being the result of corruption. The people in the Land of Papua, especially those far from urban areas, have not yet blossomed, only some of the officials and bureaucrats holding power have bloomed (Hukum.kompasiana.com, 2013).

Since the Special Autonomy Law was passed, until now there has not been a single Perdasus regulation enacted, either at the central level or at the regional level. The inhibiting factors for the implementation of the Special Autonomy Law in Papua include: First, inequality in understanding and perception of Special Autonomy. Those who gave a positive response saw the status of Special Autonomy as a way out that could prevent conflict. There are also some people who expressly reject the status of Special Autonomy and want full independence in the sense of being separated from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Ironically, different understandings or negative perceptions of Special Autonomy do not only occur among the Papuan people, but also among government officials and members of legislative institutions, both at the center and in the regions. In fact, they have the responsibility to explain the Special Autonomy correctly and clearly.

Second, there is an attitude of mutual distrust. The experiences experienced by the Papuan people during the Old Order and New Order administrations have made some Papuans no longer believe in the Special Autonomy offered by the

Central Government. On the other hand, on the part of the Central Government, there are certain groups who are worried that the Special Autonomy Law will further encourage the struggle of the Papuan people for independence. Third, the process of drafting implementing regulations (PP, Perdasu, and Perdasus) is very slow. One of the main reasons for the delay was because the Papua Autonomy Assistance Team, whose members consisted of Papuan intellectuals, was not fully and completely involved in drafting the draft implementing regulations. Without the involvement of this team, not only would the process be slow, but there could also be a missing link between the basic values and norms regulated in the Special Autonomy law.

Fourth, the inconsistent and half-hearted transfer of authority and resources by the Central Government to the Regional Government. In many cases the Central Government (in this case certain departments) is not mentally ready to hand over all of its authority and resources. There are even certain powers that have been handed over, but then withdrawn, resulting in a "pull-and-pull" between the Central Government and Regional Governments. For example, the enactment of PP No. 8 of 2003 concerning Guidelines for Regional Apparatus Organizations which are contrary to the provisions of Article 76 of Law no. 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Province of Papua. One of the true essence of Special Autonomy is that not only is the largest part of the authority delegated to the Papua Province to administer governance and development, but in line with that, all potentials for obtaining funds in the regions are fully managed by the Papua Provincial Government.

Fifth, the readiness of the Regional Government to accept and take over the authority, resources, duties, and responsibilities of the Central Government. We all understand that the capacity and capability of leadership and management of the Regional Government is not sufficient to assume and carry out the authority, duties and responsibilities delegated to the Central Government. So that the tendency to give rise to the death of the initiative and creativity of the Regional Government. Another problem is that supervision, transparency and accountability have not been running properly, thus opening up opportunities for corruption.

Sixth, the expansion of Papua Province. One of the problems that raises the pros and cons, both at the center and the regions is the issuance of Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 2003 concerning the Acceleration of the Implementation of Law no. 45 of 1999 concerning the Expansion of the Provinces of West, Central, and East Irian Jaya as well as several regencies which are contrary to the Special Autonomy Law, because with the Constitutional Court Decision No. 18/PUU-I/2003, Law no. 45 of 1999 was declared to have no binding legal force (law.kompasiana.com, 2013).

The implementation of development through Special Autonomy in the Land of Papua must be carried out by completely changing all development practices in the past, both those carried out by the government and the private sector which ignored or violated the human rights of the Papuan people. The use of excessive security approaches and military force that violated human rights in the past, which caused many

Papuans to live in fear, must be eliminated in this era of Special Autonomy. The Papuan people are basically obedient to the law, as long as the law is in favor of the interests of the people, is accommodated in a professional system and is free from intervention from any party, and its enforcers can become role models for the community.

The Indonesian government issued a policy of the Unit for the Acceleration of Development in Papua and West Papua (UP4B) which is lower than Law no. 21 of 2001. UP4B is an instrument of the SBY government to prolong and perpetuate the occupation, occupation, crime, state violence, suffering, poverty, injustice and marginalization of indigenous Papuans. After Special Autonomy and UP4B were declared a failure, now the Indonesian government declares Special Autonomy plus (law.kompasiana.com, 2013).

On July 26, 2014 the researcher conducted an interview with Reffa Hese gem as a postgraduate student at Unika Semarang. Through SMS communication by asking the question, has Papua's special autonomy failed? Regarding this question, he explained that:

Yes. In my opinion, Papua's special autonomy has failed because it has been used by Papuan political elites to seek certain positions, so that indigenous Papuans do not believe in the policy of implementing special autonomy. In addition, the expansion is everywhere that should not meet the requirements of the expansion, but manipulated data and so on. In fact, special autonomy is given to promote underdeveloped regions and manage their own natural resources to increase local revenue (PAD), but they are not utilized, instead they depend on the central government. So that the attitude and mentality of waiting and dependence on killing Papuans themselves. They don't want to think, work, and are independent, because of that the central people are easy to manage even though they have given special autonomy. Therefore, there is a need for a mental revolution for Papuans so that they are not only proud of their natural resources but remain mentally poor. Poverty is not only talking about wealth but also mentality, so that small kings appear in the area but actually do not have a direction in the area, because they only pursue and secure positions.

On the same date, the researcher conducted an interview with Frans Billy Hagabal (late), as a Papuan intellectual from Mimika Regency, through SMS communication. Related to the basic question of; Has special autonomy failed? He explained that:

Yes. Special autonomy has failed in Papua, because there is no partiality for Papuans at all. Now Papuans are increasingly marginalized on their own ancestral lands. Papuans are like immigrants and destitute in a rich country in Papua and Papuans are a minority. Special autonomy does not apply in Papua, in fact there is a failure, the State to develop Papua only has parties of interest playing in Papua. The issue of Papua is a historical problem, the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) using any strategy will not develop Papua. Jakarta has given the Special Autonomy Law to Papua but "it's like Jakarta letting go of its head but still holding on to its tail". For the implementation of special autonomy in Papua, the central government is not yet willing to issue technical regulations under it. And also the absence of technical instruments as a

guide for making perdasus and perdasi. The central government issued Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 2003 concerning the implementation of Law no. 45 of 1999. Even though Article 76 of the Special Autonomy Law states: the division of Papua Province into Provinces is carried out with the approval of the MRP and DPRD after seriously paying attention to socio-cultural unity, readiness of human resources and economic capabilities and future developments. The Central Government has committed violations so it is very difficult to believe the Central government because of the articles they set, but they themselves violated them.

2. Failure in Development in the Land of Papua

Ethnobiologically the Papuan population is an ethnic group that has its own ethnic ties that are different from other ethnic groups in Indonesia. Located at the eastern tip of Indonesia, living in the midst of isolation and far from contact with progress or modernization. The fact shows that the situation and conditions that are not conducive make the community live in a rather apprehensive level of life, as if they are the owners of isolation and poverty. At this time, most Papuans are still wearing simple clothes as a symbol of their backwardness, so those who feel they are advanced are called primitive people, stone age, gatherers, isolated people and many more stigmas are given.

There are special characteristics that mark the failure of development in Papua including:

1. Papua is a remote area, has seas and beaches, has a rough topography, has a wet tropical climate whose mountain peaks are always covered with eternal snow. Covered in forest and wet tropical rain and alpenic ecological rain.
2. The population is less than 1% of Indonesia's population. In 1969 the population of Papua was 800,000 and in 2007 the number of indigenous Papuans was 1.6 million. This means that approximately 40 years of minimal population growth (minimizing zero growth). They live scattered and isolated on mountain slopes, valleys and mountain crevices that are difficult to reach even far from government service centers.
3. Their socio-economic conditions are very concerning, namely the housing conditions are very emergency living in honai/gibbons, their consumption patterns are very irregular, most of them are almost naked (koteka) and the pattern of the economy is subsistence.
4. The general social condition of the community is still simple, the level of education is relatively low, the level of health and nutrition is vulnerable, the level of mastery of technology is low.
5. The development of the people's economy in this area is generally not maximized, due to the lack of insight into people's thinking as well as awareness to the community, including the lack of land and air transportation infrastructure besides being very far away in remote, isolated and remote areas. The entire transportation network is carried out by air. The delay in the construction of the Trans Papua road has not had a positive impact, especially population mobilization, both urbanization and reurbanization, the mobility of goods and services.

If we look back at the root of the problem in Papua, it is substantially the issue of independence, both political

independence and independence from the 5 K (Poverty, Ignorance, Underdevelopment, Nudity and Moral Degeneration). These two issues have been the main causes of development failure in Papua during the nearly 40 years since integration.

First, the issue of political independence (trauma historicism), this political conflict in Papua does not fall from the sky, it has historical roots and these historical roots often stem from the history of colonialism. Because of that, the issue of Papua began with the history of colonialism, namely when the Dutch colonialists and Indonesian imperialists were present (assumed). Political integration of this region is still not stable. This is because the claims of Indonesia and the Netherlands both through diplomacy and confrontation are filled with a cooperative attitude between the authorities for the sake of containing the ideology of international communism which is unsympathetic in the hearts of the Papuans. Never involve the Papuan people in the political integration process, from every negotiation the Papuan people act as objects, not as subjects in decision-making. Even more ironic is the violation of the right to self-determination for a nation (GA Resolution No 1541 (XV)) in 1960, which at the same time in West Papua has declared a declaration of independence and the socialization of national symbols. In addition, the 1969 political consensus, known as the Act of Free Choice, was carried out under Indonesian pressure, including the implementation of a democratic system based on Pancasila, namely deliberation and consensus which differs from international standards (one man one vote) according to the New York Agreement. Indonesia's reason that the holding of deliberation for consensus was due to social, economic, geographical and civilized conditions of primitive life, this is a denial of the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 14 December 1960 (GA Resolution No. 1514 (XV)) which emphasized that colonialism with all its manifestations must end so that the reason for the lack of readiness from political, economic or social conditions is not a reason for delaying independence for a nation. Expression of disappointment with the implementation, a serious threat emerged from a group called the Free Papua Movement (OPM). Since then the Jakarta government has begun to strengthen the stability of political integration by placing Papuans in the puddle of state corporatism hegemony, the people are discriminated against, forced to sign, instructed, this must not be so and so, the practice of terror by mysterious cliques in order to accept, respect, obey and submit to the symbols of the nation-state (nation-state). The people filled with totalitarian fear. For this reason, as long as they are integrated with Indonesia, the people have rebelled through various acts of rioting, destruction, murder, and hostage-taking, all of which are targeted at immigrant communities (outsiders of Papua) who are an integral part of the Indonesian political system, brown people, Caucasians. This is an expression of disappointment and an expression of hatred from the historical trauma and history of the suffering of the Papuan people (the history of sadness) against the Indonesian nation-state government.

Second, the issue of socio-economic independence (economic and social disparities. It is undeniable that the

Papuan people are rich in invaluable natural resources, but in fact they are the poorest in this century. Indonesia has started to determine the benchmark of its poverty with the kebaya cloth, but Papuans (The mountain) is in nudity and isolation (The stone age period society in 21st century) stone age society in the twenty-first century. Whose fault is that? Why were they integrated if Jakarta didn't want to build them? The world already knows that stone age people Papua and West Papua are Indonesia. Since the beginning of integration, the Jakarta government has focused on economic and social development. Socio-economic development has been carried out politically. Since 1963-1969, during the transition period, there were nuances of development such as the establishment of schools, from kindergarten to the Cendrawasih University (Uncen) university, the development of infrastructure, human resource development by placing Papuan educated elites in government posts. Even the governor was given to a native Papuan son who was never felt by the Papuans in the Dutch era. However, all socio-economic policies are controlled by the military with its binomial adage, namely security and development. The military is in command of all final decision-making, development with the Task forces program with the assistance of Fundwi and ADB funds, but these funds are allocated to defense and security funds, so that socio-economic development funds are actually neglected. It is therefore not surprising that in 1996 77% of villages in Irian Jaya were below the poverty line and became the target villages of the IDT program and in 2005 nearly 85 percent of the Papuan population was poor. Most of the Papuans are farming and unfortunately some of the agricultural land has been plotted by the authorities, for example agriculture covering an area of 8.65%, population settlements 3.36%, socio-cultural facilities 1.75%, Transmigration covering an area of 0.55% while the use of land for other needs less than 1%. Thus, most of the land in Papua is owned by the state with an area of 1,528,277 ha (993.36%) so that people have difficulty finding a good place to live with wet settlements because it is feared that the future of their children and grandchildren will languish on their own land.

Besides that, the opening of industrialization by relying on the use of advanced technology that cannot be met by local communities, sending skilled workers from outside to the exclusion of local workers, along with the provision of compensation that is smaller than it should be, triggers the gap, especially PT. Freeport Indonesia. The implication is that the government ignores socio-economic development with the consideration that Papuans remain in a stagnant condition so that in the future there will be changes in the number of populations, including; the life expectancy is shortened, the growth rate is slowed down, the death rate is increasing, the disease epidemic is rampant, towards the uniformity of ethnic, cultural, artistic, including the socio-cultural system, the adage became legend and imagination in the 20th century that passed. The attitude of the local population to the development offer.

One of the logical consequences of accommodative leadership is that there has been a lack of attention to local communities for some time and now the government is considered to have failed and failed to respond to the challenges

and substance of the problem. There are several contradictory things in Papua today, namely:

1. Physical development with a project approach may only be in accordance with the government's view but not in accordance with the wishes of the community.
2. The people are considered only important to support development goals according to the wishes of the leaders and the people are considered to have accepted the development that has been built.
3. There is a symptom that the community is not expected for development because development has been thought of by the leader himself.
4. There is coercion of the will of development on the people to be accepted and carried out with the argument that people's living standards are grown and improved without creating conditions to grow and develop themselves.
5. There is a tendency for local residents to sink between sincere expectations without reality. Because they are not used to acting autonomously in the situations they experience.
6. As a result of the wrong development approach, their adaptive capacity is passive and uncritical, the attitude of legowo is more dominant than the attitude of criticism in the face of modernization.

IV. CLOSING

With the presence of special autonomy in Papua Province, the Papuan people have never felt satisfaction, joy 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 that is faced in the era of special autonomy, so that in carrying out demonstrations everywhere to reject special autonomy, in that demand the indigenous Papuan people say that " must restore special autonomy or special autonomy has failed". Indigenous Papuans also say that special autonomy has failed, due to strengthening for several reasons during the twelve years of implementation of special autonomy, they do not see fundamental changes or significant

changes in development, especially the development of education, health and people's economic growth for the progress and independence of the community. Papuan native.

The public's assessment of the allocation of the Papua Province special autonomy funds, it seems that the little kings from Papua have not shown the level of honesty and transparency, because it is proven by the infrastructure development that there has been no significant change, even though the main goal is to give birth to special autonomy for the Papua Province in order to reduce conflicts. in Papua Province, welfare and empowerment of indigenous Papuans, but conflict is growing, poverty is even higher in Eastern Indonesia, including Papua Province.

The public's assessment of the allocation of the Papua Province special autonomy funds, it seems that the little kings from Papua have not shown the level of honesty and transparency, because it is proven by the infrastructure development that there has been no significant change, even though the main goal is to give birth to special autonomy for the Papua Province in order to reduce conflicts. in Papua Province, welfare and empowerment of indigenous Papuans, but conflict is growing, poverty is even higher in Eastern Indonesia, including Papua Province.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Kum, Krinus. 2015. Papua Special Autonomy Development Implementation Policy Between Failure and Success, Yogyakarta: Literature Book
- [2]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua Province
- [3]. Presidential Regulation No. 65 of 2011 concerning the Acceleration of Development of the Provinces of Papua and West Papua
- [4]. Presidential Regulation No. 66 of 2011 concerning the Unit for the Acceleration of Development of the Papua Province and West Papua Province
- [5]. Presidential Instruction Number 5 of 2007 concerning the Implementation of Special Autonomy for the Provinces of Papua and West Papua