



ARTICLE

Received  
20 February 2022

Accepted  
15 October 2022

Published online  
1 November 2022

Author(s)

\* Corresponding Author  
Ester Yambeyapdi  
[JeanSharon.2003@gmail.com](mailto:JeanSharon.2003@gmail.com)  
+62 812-9352-7579  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,  
Cenderawasih University, Jayapura

## Paradigm of Special Autonomy and National Integration in Papua

Ester Yambeyapdi

**Abstract:** The New Order regime's way of resolving the problem of Papua's national integration did not produce desirable results. The New Order regime, with its authoritarian and centralized practices, has provided valuable lessons for the nation. This study is a review of political history that aimed to analyze the national integration issues in several areas in Papua, which has not been resolved during the 21 years of Special Autonomy in Papua. The results of the study showed that the situation of the Papuan during the New Order Regime influenced the national integration of Papuans during the Special Autonomy implementation. The issue of Papua's national integration during the New Order regime and the Special Autonomy implementation in the Reformation era was an anomaly in the truth because the truth was determined by the ruler (hegemonic authority). The special autonomy has accelerated the development of Papua, but also created discrimination between tribes and groups in social, cultural, economic, and political life. Learning from history, to avoid making the same mistakes in the future, the humanist approach taken by the church can be a solution to unify the differences between Papuan "Komen" and migrants "Amber." The church teaches the value of love, peace, sacrifice, and unifying forgiveness. Reconciliation with the memory of the sufferings of the Papuan is a bridge that connects the Papuan to a dignified life as part of Indonesia. Papua's Special Autonomy is a nationwide process to improve itself and a path toward the goal of realizing the ideals of the proclamation. Alignment to basic human needs, following the noble ideals of the August 17, 1945, Proclamation of Independence, allows Papuans not to question or doubt the integration of Papua into the Republic of Indonesia.

**Keywords:** public welfare; special autonomy; special autonomy

### About the Author(s)

Ester Yambeyapdi is a lecturer at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Cenderawasih University. She can be contacted by email at [JeanSharon.2003@gmail.com](mailto:JeanSharon.2003@gmail.com)



## I. Introduction

Papua has been experiencing problems related to its national integration into Indonesia since 1969. The problems took the form of armed rebellion, mass demonstrations, social protests, and foreign intervention through the support of the Free Papua Movement by European countries, such as Britain and the Netherlands, and the South Pacific countries of Vanuatu, Fiji, and Solomon. There are no records on the conditions of Papuans prior to its integration with the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. After the integration in 1969, during the New Order era, the Northern, Eastern, Western, and Central Papua experienced different developments. Western, Northern and Southern Papua was first influenced by outsiders (Islam, Protestant and Catholic missions). After that, they start to influence the central Papua (Yambeyapdi, 2016). Due to its remote geographical conditions and socio-cultural limitations, the development of the central mountainous part of Papua was lagging compared to the Western, Northern, and Southern Papua. Communities living in the various areas also show different reactions to the idea of national integration of Papua. People living in the mountainous area in central Papua tend to have difficulty adapting to changes, while people living in other regions are more open to something that originate from outside their socio-cultural life.

According to Elisabeth (2006) and Rianda et al. (2017), the West Papua case was a ticking bomb for Indonesia. Many factors can make the Papua issue become a big and open issue, such as political, security, social, and economic factors. The diverse dimensions of issues in Papua - local, national, and international - potentially can turn local problems into national ones and vice versa. Socio-politically, the issuance of Law No. 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for Papua was driven by the pressure of the Papuan to demand independence during the 1998-2000. This aspiration arose due to three reasons: First, political integrity history. Second, state violence and human rights violations against the Papuan. Third, failure of development in education, health, economy, and infrastructure. Moreover, the local and national dimensions of the Papuan issue are very likely to become an international issue when it involves the interests, and the political and economic roles of foreign parties. The international characteristics or dimensions of the Papua case are determined by state actors and non-state actors who have consistently and continuously "internationalized" the Papua issue, for example,

through lobbying and diplomacy, both carried out by the government of Indonesia as well as parties opposed to the Government of Indonesia, including the Free Papua Organization (OPM) and several members of the Papua Presidium Council (PDP) (Elisabeth, 2006). Through the PDP, Papuans demanded independence during the 1999 Reformasi (including the raising of the Morning Star flag) and responded to the demand from the international community that Indonesia resolves the issue of human rights violations.

Coleman and Rosberg (as cited in Bahar & Tangdiling, 1996, p. 4) stated that the process of national unity in a country consists of two dimensions: vertical (elite-mass) and horizontal (territorial). Vertical integration covers problems in the vertical plane to bridge the gaps that may exist between the elite and the Papuan masses in developing an integrated political process and a participating political society. Territorial integration is integration in the horizontal plane to reduce discontinuity and cultural tensions during the creation of a homogeneous political society. Sjamsuddin (as cited in Bahar & Tangdiling, 1996, pp. 3-7) stated that Coleman and Rosberg's opinion only focuses on the integrated factors.

Many other elements influence and may determine the existence of elite-mass gaps and territorial differences, such as aspects of human life that do not recognize the boundaries of space and time, namely political, economic, social, and cultural elements. Thus, the most important matter is how these factors determine the process.

After the 1999 Reformasi in Indonesia, a group of Papuans held demonstrations in various areas (Papua, Jakarta, Yogyakarta, Surabaya), voicing the slogans of Free Papua. What was the reason or motivation behind this action? Was Papua forced to be integrated with the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI)? It seems that the New Order regime, through its political, security, economic, social, and cultural policies, has triggered resistance movement that received international support, especially from countries in the South Pacific region (Yambeyapdi, 2018).

The issue of national integration in Papua has been studied by experts in the fields of history, politics, and socio-economy. One of them was the work of Leirissa et al. (1992) entitled "Sejarah Proses Integrasi Irian Jaya (The History of the Integration Process of Irian Jaya)," which explained that the historical process of Papua's integration into Indonesia caused the birth of the Free Papua Movement Organization. Sjamsuddin

(1989) stated that the problem of integration in Papua was influenced by two factors: first, it was mostly a horizontal (territorial) dimension, and second, its integration process was hampered due to the separatist movement. In line with Sjamsuddin's opinion, Djopari (1993), in his master's thesis entitled "Pemberontakan Organisasi Papua Merdeka (Free Papua Movement Rebellion)," described the integration of Papua as a political agenda.

In line with the studies described above, Garnaut (1979) revealed the situations of Papua integration from an economic and social perspective. They explained the situations or limitations of Papua's social and economic facilities during the transition period.

In an article entitled "Tinjauan Empiris Integrasi Nasional Papua: Aspek Internasional (Empirical Overview of Papuan National Integration: International Aspects)," Bhakti (1996) revealed that other than the Indonesia-Papua New Guinea (PNG) relations, the existing socio-cultural and economic conditions during the transition period in Papua also influenced the issue of national integration in Papua.

Regarding the dangers of disintegration, according to the study by Mashad and Bhakti (1999), the problem of separatism and the desire of the Papuans to leave the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia was caused by the imbalance of central government policies (the New Order) in the socio-cultural, economic and political and legal fields, as well as the support of foreign countries. The study also stated that the historical factor of during the integration of Papua into the Republic of Indonesia was a trigger for the disintegration.

One of the studies on Papuan community behind the birth of the Special Autonomy Law for the Papua Province was the work edited by Sumule (2003) entitled Mencari Jalan Tengah Otonomi Khusus Provinsi Papua (Finding a Compromise for the Special Autonomy Policy for the Papua Province). This book discussed the main ideas of drafting the Special Autonomy Law in Papua and reflected on all the problems in Papua, including human rights, social, economic, and political issues, as well as reviewed Papua's integration into the Republic of Indonesia. Solossa's study (2005) entitled "Otonomi Khusus: Mengangkat Martabat Rakyat Papua di dalam NKRI (Special Autonomy: Elevating the Dignity of the Papuan People Within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia)" can also be used as a source.

Based on the analysis of several published studies, the author found that two main issues determine the style, content, and nature of the studies: the topics selected usually reflect emerging issues and the interests/needs of the people at the time of the study.

Historical works, as with other sciences, are products of the culture of the people at a certain period of time, which arises from their need to know about their past and understand the future that they might have with the current situation. History, as E.H.Carr put it, is a dialogue between the present and the past. The acknowledgment that today is an extension of yesterday supports the fact that the current reality cannot be separated from the previous one. Therefore, awareness of the connection between the past, present, future, and historical knowledge is useful.

In history, change is a certainty. Then what does it mean when people question or are skeptical of their past? Papuans doubt the legality of their integration into the Republic of Indonesia. There is a group of people who want the rectification of the history of Papua, and there must be a reconciliation dialogue between Papua and Jakarta. Girolamo Arnoldi stated the past or history can be a liberator. On the contrary, Frederick Hegel stated that history is a "shackle" or, in other words, a burden. Something that has historical importance is usually because of an issue or problem that arises in the present or because it needs to be explained from a historical perspective. It is natural to seek the answer to the needs of the present with a historical perspective by understanding what has happened in the past (Zuhdi, 2018).

The object of this study is the Papuan and government/state policies related to national integration in Papua from the New Order until the time of the study. This study is a historical study that is different from the previous studies that generally examine Papuan issues from the political aspect. The study of history is an event in the past or past human events.

History, in this context, is an objective event that only happened once and will not happen again. History as an event cannot be reconstructed without a source. Such source can be written and unwritten sources or documents and artifacts of human activities. To explain the historical events of national integration and the Special Autonomy Policy in Papua, the author uses the concept of Thomas Khun's paradigm and anomaly.

Papua's Special Autonomy Policy has been implemented for 21 years (2001 – 2022), but the problems of national integration in some areas of Papua have not been resolved. The granting of Special Autonomy is expected to resolve the issue of Papua's national integration. However, it has not delivered the desired results. Intimidation, violence, and violations of human rights continued. For this reason, the author is interested in reconstructing "The Paradigm of Special Autonomy and National Integration in Papua."

## II. Methods

This study was a historical study using historical research methods. The historical research method consists of four stages (Garraghan, 1957, p. 33; Gottschalk, 1986, p. 18), namely:

1. The heuristics or data collection stage. This is a stage of finding and collecting historical sources. In this study, the researcher collects research data using:
  - a. Literature Review: collecting sources in the form of books, newspapers/online newspapers such as Suara Papua, CNN, historical and political journals with the theme of Papua's Special Autonomy and Papuan national integration, research reports, and others that support this research in several libraries and archive centers in Jayapura City, such as the Papua Regional library, the Cendrawasih University library, the IS Theology Kaje Abepura College library, Kaje Abepura, and STFT Fajar Timur Jayapura Library.
  - b. Field Study in Jayapura: conducting interview to identify the reaction of the Papuan to the Special Autonomy Policy. Parties who were interviewed were those who understand the context under study. An interview is a form of oral history method. This method is a typical form of collecting historical writing materials, in which the required data is obtained through oral interviews. The information obtained with this method is based on experience, vision, or testimony from the narrator, not what he heard from other people (Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 1981). The author conducted interviews/discussions with Albert Rumbekwan and Dr. Bernarda Meteray, lecturer of the History Study Program, FKIP Cendrawasih University

Jayapura, and Dr. Adriana Elisabeth, a former researcher at LIPI and one of the initiators of the Papuan reconciliation dialogue.

Data collected through interviews were intended to complement the written data obtained through the literature review. A literature review is used as a comparison and analysis material to deepen knowledge about the problems discussed (Singarimbun & Effendi, 1983, p. 45).

2. The criticism or data assessment stage. This is the stage of selecting data sources by determining their credibility through internal criticism and their authenticity through external criticism. As such, the credibility and authenticity of the historical sources are determined before they can be used in the next stage.
3. The interpretation stages.
4. The historiography or writing stage. This is the stage of synthesizing the facts to be displayed in a complete story in the form of writing or a study report.

## III. Results and Discussion

### A. Paradigms, Anomalies, and Truth

The history of the integration of Papua into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia from 1963 to 1969 remains vivid in the memory of the Papuan today. In their view, there has been a mistake in the history of the integration, and history must be rectified. During the New Order regime, the issue of Papua's national integration was said to have been resolved. Papuans are considered objects, not subjects, of development. If anyone speaks out about the injustice, the regime will label them "OPM" and silence them. Everything was made to look like they were stable and subject to the hegemony of Suharto and his regime. This situation drastically changed when Suharto stepped down in 1998. The silenced voices rebelled and were expressed everywhere through demonstrations and free expression of opinion. Papuans "demand independence." This situation caused the central government to appease it with the granting of Special Autonomy in 2001. For the central government, the Special Autonomy Policy is a solution to the problem of Papua's national integration.

The central government's attempt to solve the problem of national integration through the grant of a special autonomy status as a solution is an anomaly paradigm, as stated by the American writer Thomas Kuhn, who is famous for his book entitled *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1970, pp. 149, 150, 94). Kuhn introduced the concept of a scientific paradigm to provide a sociological explanation of the emergence of changes in scientific opinion and method. Epistemologically, a paradigm can be seen as a model or pattern. Based on terminology, a paradigm is a basic idea with assumptions and variables of ideas. Kuhn uses this term in his explanation of how the widely accepted framework was overthrown and replaced by another.

He distinguished three phases in the life of every science. The first phase is the pre-science phase, often referred to as the metaphysical paradigm, in which various unstructured and uncoordinated activities occur. If these activities are taken up and regulated by what he calls a scientific community, that community adheres to a paradigm. Paradigms consist of various techniques, assumptions, and theories used by members of society in pursuing their knowledge. While they work within the framework of a paradigm, they practice what Kuhn referred to as "normal science." Kuhn referred to this phase as the second phase or also often called the sociological paradigm. Kuhn said that normal science is characterized by a period of calm, steady development and is dominated by a set of accepted concepts. The third phase consists of a crisis within science, which results in a period of radical change when the ruling paradigm is overthrown by another. This is a paradigm shift or scientific revolution. This phase is often referred to as the constructivist paradigm. The most famous examples are the overthrow of Ptolemaic astronomy by Copernicus and the replacement of Newtonian mechanics by Einstein's theory of relativity.

Kuhn asserts that, although a paradigm must be supported by convincing evidence and arguments, it is not accepted for purely objective reasons. Instead, it gained acceptance because the consensus in the scientific community agreed to use it. Many of the conclusions of Kuhn and his followers have parallels with French radical theory. In particular, Michel Foucault's *History of Ideas* follows Kuhn's concepts very closely. Kuhn's idea of a "paradigm" is what Foucault calls an "episteme." Kuhn's argument that habits and the power of consensus determine what is accepted as scientific truth is almost identical to Foucault's

claim that truth is determined by a group of intellectual forces.

In the early 1960s, the Viennese-born philosopher based in England, Karl Popper, was widely considered to have solved one of the problems in philosophy: the justification of the empirical scientific method. Popper was a leading advocate of the "falsifiability" principle from the 1930s to the 1980s. He challenged the view accepted by most scientists that evidence is used to verify scientific theories. The traditional method of scientific induction since the writings of Francis Bacon in the early seventeenth century is that scientific knowledge is obtained by generalizing a set of observations. Popper claims that the role of proper evidence is to falsify scientific conjectures. Thus, in contrast to the traditional view that a scientific theory can be proven by observation, Popper argues that a scientific theory can be falsified. According to Popper (1959), a theory is not something that can be determined as conclusively true in observation or experiment. On the contrary, a theory is a speculation, a conjecture, or a conjecture about some aspect of the cosmos. The role of observation and experimentation is to rigorously test these theoretical conjectures and eliminate those who fail to withstand the applied test. Science advances by trial and error, with observation and experiment progressively eliminating unproven theories. We learn not by our experience but by our mistakes.

Despite its wide acceptance, Popper's theory was subject to some criticism from the start. Kuhn (1970, pp. 146–147) argues that Popper's approach is slightly different from the verification theory designed to replace it. All scientific theories are accompanied by anomalies that they find difficult to explain. As Kuhn points out, anomalies are rarely considered falsifications but rather seen as "the incompleteness and imperfection of existing theories that fit at any time to define many puzzles, which characterizes normal science." If these anomalous observations are powerful enough to overturn an existing theory, then the anomaly acts as "perhaps as well as a verification" for the emerging paradigm in the field.

According to Kuhn (1970, pp. 94, 153, 156), the criterion used to judge whether a scientific theory is superior to its rivals is the one that the scientists placed the greatest value on how it fits the facts better, how it makes predictions better, and how it can solve more problems. In other words, the value system and opinion of the scientific community are the determining factors.

Kuhn is very specific about this. "As in the political revolution, so in the choice of paradigm - there is no higher standard than the consent of the relevant community." Since Kuhn recognized that values and standards prevailing in the scientific community varied widely, depending on the cultural and past backgrounds of the time, this means that in Kuhn's account, there is no universal standard by which to judge scientific theory. In other words, Kuhn's position is relativist - successful scientific theories are relative to their own values, culture, and tastes. This was the point Lakatos used to critique Kuhn. Lakatos (1976) said, "the truth lies in power." In the case of Papua's national integration and the granting of the special autonomy status, it is an anomaly from the government's version of the truth.

The government has several reasons/recommendations for the issue of Papua's national integration.

## **B. Power and Truth in the Papuan Integration History**

After Suharto's resignation on 21 May 1998, which marked the beginning of the reform era, in May and June 1998, several demonstrations in Papua raised the Morning Star flag as an expression of the freedom of speech after the 32 years of military intimidation and terror due to authoritarianism and centralism of Suharto's New Order regime. For Papuans, freedom of expression about their lives and natural resources has been confined by the power of the New Order regime since Papua's integration into Indonesia and the 32 years of the New Order regime.

The Government's solution by granting the Special Autonomy status in 2001 in response to the demand for Papua independence was prompted by demonstrations and the raising of the Morning Star flag everywhere, led by students and youth and directed at the government and security forces. They demand attention to (1) resolve the human rights violations, (2) their rights to participate in the civil service and government bureaucracy, (3) control the appropriation of Papua's natural resources, (4) transmigration issues, and (5) the issue of customary land rights. However, in July 1998, especially after the raising of the Morning Star flag in Sorong and Biak, the tone of the demands shifted from the negative impact of development mentioned earlier to the aspirations and demands of an independent Papua. This demand to break away from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia was revealed on 26 February 1999,

during a dialogue between President BJ Habibie and Team 100, which represented the Papuan. It can be said that this dialog is the starting point of diverting attention from various aspects of the life of the Papuan into a political struggle for the "emancipation" of the Papuan, which gain broad support from the Papuan (Penggu, 2002, p. 37).

Amid the confusion and the absence of a solution that the government and security forces could take in response to the aspirations and demands of the Papuan, the government divided Irian Jaya (Papua) into three provinces. But the public responded negatively and generally rejected it. The process of division and the inauguration of two new governors (11 October 1999) was carried out unilaterally without listening to the aspirations of the people. President Abdurrahman Wahid's government realized this, and the expansion plan was "shelved." The government's efforts have also intensified, including allowing the change of the name "Irian Jaya" to "Papua," approving the holding of the Papuan's Congress (29 May 4-June 2000) and allowing the Morning Star flag to be raised (Penggu, 2002).

At the end of July 2000, Bappenas held a meeting of district heads throughout Irian Jaya, accompanied by the Deputy Governor of Government Affairs, John R.G. Djopari. The central government provides a budget of Rp1.7 trillion to restore the trust of the Papuan in the Indonesian government. Of these funds, Rp440 billion has been disbursed, and each district/municipality has received Rp23 billion for crash programs, including the empowerment of the Papua Task Force. However, the efforts to restore the Papuan's trust in the Indonesian Government—by splitting Papua into several provinces, which was later canceled, changing the name of Irian Jaya to Papua, allowing the Papuan's Congress to be held in Jayapura, raising the Morning Star Flag and providing funds amounting to Rp1.7 trillion—did not address the root cause of the problem (Penggu, 2002).

At that time, the problem occurred due to two main reasons. The first was a growing distrust of the Papuan in the government and the emergence of the belief that the problem could only be solved by their independence. This distrust was expressed through protests by raising the Morning Star flag as a symbol of resistance to the injustice and inequality in regional development during the thirty-eight years of integration. The second was the breakdown of social ties and integration due to the manipulation during the three decades of

the New Order era, as happened in Maluku, Aceh, and Wamena on October 6, 2000 (Penggu, 2002).

Law Number 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for the Papua Province as amended by Law Number 35 of 2008 on the Enactment of Government Regulations in Lieu of Law Number 1 of 2008 on the Amendments to Law Number 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for the Papua Province into Law (hereinafter referred to as the Special Autonomy Law for Papua and West Papua) is a win-win solution to the desire of indigenous Papuans to be independent of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. The desire of indigenous Papuans for independence became clearer and stronger after the fall of Suharto's regime on May 21, 1998 (Majelis Rakyat Papua, 2013, p. 1).

### C. Papua Development Post 1969 Referendum (Perpera)

After the referendum (Perpera) carried out successfully in 1969, then officially and in accordance with international law, Papua became an absolute part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. At that point, like it or not, all Papuans must adapt to the model of government run by the New Order regime (Yambeyapdi, 2016).

In describing the public reaction to national integration and development programs in Papua after the 1969 referendum, the researcher used Acub Zainal's memoirs (Hendrowinoto, 1998) to explain it since this book provides the closest account of the situation.

According to Acub Zainal, the disappointment of the Papuan (at that time, Irian Jaya) towards Indonesia started right after the Referendum took place. Equipment left by the Dutch was transported to other parts of Indonesia, including military equipment, government office equipment, home furnishings, and others. The people of West Irian were astonished by this event. Acub Zainal admitted that this shameful event took place, which caused discontent among the masses. Residents who were considered pro-Dutch were also terrorized. Dutch letters and printed books were burned, which caused of loss of information about West Irian.

Acub Zainal said:

Our republic is ashamed. Its image is very bad. At that time, our Republic was in a bad shape. Chocolates, confectioneries, or

beers, which are only available in Irian, are all confiscated. Bottles planted for fences were dug up, picked up, and transported. I also went along and took a carpet.

When Acub Zainal was assigned as Pangdam XII/Cenderawasih Irian Jaya, his first task was dealing with the OPM rebellion led by the legendary rebel Ferry Awom. This OPM figure is a former member of the Papuan Volunteer Battalion. To deal with him, Acub Zainal led a campaign that he referred to as the "Operasi Pamungkas (the Ultimate Operation)." Ferry Awom had led the rebellion for five years (from July 1965 to October 1970 (Hendrowinoto, 1998) when he surrendered less than nine months after Acub Zainal started the campaign.

The official ceremony of his surrender took place at the Borasi field, Manokwari, on November 19, 1970. Ferry Awom, along with 20 armed rebel, 16 tribal chiefs, and 500 people, officially surrendered and handed over their weapons to the XVII/Cenderawasih Commander, Acub Zainal. Ferry Awom and his followers take an oath of allegiance to the Republic of Indonesia and help implement government programs with their subordinates (Hendrowinoto, 1998).

After the Awom's rebellion was quelled, development in eastern Indonesia began to be carried out in various fields.

#### 1. Socio-Cultural

Members of the Indonesian Military (TNI) received an education to fulfill the main tasks of the regional military command (Kodam) in Irian. This education includes courses for military police officers, class II intelligence officers, Infantry Battalion refresher training, territorial courses, squad commander courses, and the Non-commissioned Officer and PKD soldiers' courses. Company A Yon 751/Cenderawasih in Sidei Manokwari also opened community education courses with local youths (Hendrowinoto, 1998).

Kodam XVII Cenderawasih directed all its resources and funds to develop their area, including establishing the Bumi Cenderawasih housing complex in Jayapura, Ifar Gunung, Sorong, Biak, and Manokwari, as well as Guest houses in Ifar Gunung and Biak. Some of the building materials were made by the soldiers. Yon 752/ Cenderawasih, for example, made bricks in Sorong.

The construction of the soldier's house was Acub Zainal's main priority of development. He was deeply concerned when he first saw the condition of the soldiers in Irian. Soldier's housing at that time was not much different from rundown huts. Acub Zainal's works also included the construction of transportation facilities, especially bridges and airports. He also cleared land for long and short-term crops, gardens, and fishponds. Experimental rice paddy fields were made in Agete, churches were built in Ateka/Kokonao villages, teachers' housing, and school buildings were built in Wasior, and humanitarian projects were launched in Akimuka, Kaimana, Merauke, and Kebar Manokwari. The Ransiki airfield was repaired. The construction of the Wamena airfield, which could serve as a runway for large aircraft such as the Hercules, took place beyond expectations. The airfield was planned to be completed in June 1971, but on August 22, 1970, the first Hercules aircraft managed to land at this field earlier than previously planned (Hendrowinoto, 1998).

The development goal of West Irian, especially the Baliem valley area, is to bring civilization to the Baliem valley that have long been inaccessible from the outside world. It was also aimed to transport produce from the Baliem valley to other areas of West Irian. In Pike, Jayawijaya district, a suspension bridge was built to cross the Baliem river. The Cenderawasih I sports field and swimming pool were built in Jayapura, as well as the Cenderawasih II in Biak, to improve sports facilities. For health, the Cenderawasih Pharmacy has also opened in Jayapura, which can serve the general public's need for medicines (Hendrowinoto, 1998).

Cultural development was also carried out. Members of the music corps provided music education for the community. Children in villages was educated and trained in various sports. Encouraging cooperation to establish schools, vocational courses, eradication of illiteracy, and others, on November 21, 1971, Acub Zainal inaugurated the Tjandra Student Regiment, with approximately 250 members from Cenderawasih University, Academy of Theology, and the Akademi Pemerintahan Daerah (Regional Government Academy) (Hendrowinoto, 1998).

Military health personnel were also assigned to provide information on health and hygiene in villages, maintenance of water reservoirs, eradication of pests and disease outbreaks, and healthy food. For religion, members of the military religion unit were encouraged to build houses of

worship, as well as provide religious education to bring the animist Irian society towards monotheism. Through these development programs, the military image started to shift in the eye of the people of West Irian. People increasingly believed that the military was a place to file a complaint, a place to solve a dispute between tribes. People started to go into the forest. Tribes in the interior, which were often involved in conflicts, began to integrate. People's suspicion of foreigners was lessened.

In the end, the opening of access did not only connect the divided Irian community but also opened it to the outside world, which had further consequences. The world beyond Irian sees the less-than-modern tribes living in the interior part of Irian as a spectacle. Acub Zainal seems to be aware of this anthropological sensitivity.

In 1971, Acub Zainal ran the Operation Koteka to prepare the people of Irian to face the outside world. However, this operation was faced with many challenges from various parties and did not receive much support. Operation Koteka is a historical event for the people of Irian. Modernization in the outside world seems to clash with the reality of some West Irian that live in the interior, far from the modern world. Acub Zainal did not want the people of Irian to be treated as an anthropological display for outsiders, a scientific spectacle for researchers, and a tourism spectacle for tourists. Many people were sent for the Operation Koteka. Soldiers, police officers, students, and employees were sent to the villages. There, they show people how to cook, dress, or play sport. First, the people came to see them doing their activities, then, after a long time, they were invited to participate.

When Acub Zainal was appointed governor of Irian replacing Frans Kaisiepo in 1973, he tried to carry out this function with various considerations. During his tenure, Irian experienced significant developments. It means that he seeks to put the development program on the right footing: that the sons and daughters of Irian Jaya need to feel proud to be part of the Indonesian state. The pride of the Irian community must be developed. He tried hard to find subordinates from the native Irian people.

With an all-out development strategy, Acub Zainal began to build Irian. Jayapura, the capital of Irian Jaya, was getting busier. To foster the spirit of Indonesian nationalism for the Papuans, Acub Zainal brought many artists from Jakarta who entertained the public almost once a month. Artists who have visited Irian Jaya include: Titiek



Sandhora, Titiek Puspa, Benjamin, Tetty Kadi, and others. Acub Zainal held the beauty queen contest in Jayapura and formed the Black Brother Band. The band was popular not only in Irian but also nationally after the Black Brothers started performing frequently in Jakarta (Hendrowinoto, 1998).

The development policies carried out by Acub Zainal for Irian backfired on him. He was dismissed from his position as Governor of Irian Jaya before his term of office ended. Acub Zainal was replaced by Colonel Soetran, the former Regent of Trenggalek. Supposedly, he was dismissed because the Ministry of Defense and Security needed him for another job.

After his futile attempts to find out the reason for his dismissal, Acub Zainal returned to Jayapura and found Colonel Soetran, who would replace him, was already there. Preparations for his replacement were much faster than Acub Zainal's attempts to find out the reason behind his dismissal.

However, his sudden stop shows that there are two different sides of the history. For the people of Irian Jaya, during his tenure as the Governor of Irian, Acub Zainal had developed Irian in such a way that is unmatched by other governors after him. The people of Irian still remember him as "our father." However, for Amir Mahmud, Acub Zainal was seen to have acted outside the budget. The dismissal of Acub Zainal was probably nothing unusual in the New Order regime (Hendrowinoto, 1998).

#### **D. National Integration in Papua During the Implementation of the Special Autonomy Policy**

When the Papua Special Autonomy Law was enacted in Papua, several basic values were used as guidance. The Assistance Team (Solossa, 2005; Sumule, 2003) stated that the Special Autonomy Law for the Papua Province was developed and implemented based on several basic values to fulfill the basic rights and obligations of the Papuan. These basic values stem from the customs of the Papuan, nationalism based on universal humanitarian principles, and respect for democracy and human rights.

The basic values are the main principles and the spiritual atmosphere that underlies the preparation of the basic framework for the Special Autonomy Law for the Province of Papua, which is then expected to serve as a basic guideline for the

implementation of various aspects of the Special Autonomy Policy for Papua in the future (Pekey, 2018; Solossa, 2005; Sumule, 2003).

There are seven basic values of Papua's Special Autonomy Policy, which are: (1) protection of the basic rights of indigenous Papuans; (2) democracy and democratic maturity; (3) respect for ethics and morals; (4) respect for human rights; (5) respect for the rule of law; (6) respect for pluralism; and (7) equality of position, rights, and obligations as citizens (Pekey, 2018; Solossa, 2005; Sumule, 2003).

Before the implementation of the Special Autonomy Policy for Papua (during the New Order era), Papua experienced problems of limited access to control of economic resources, lack of involvement in the government bureaucracy (which was dominated by people from outside Papua), intimidation by the military, and human rights violations. The issue of national integration in Papua was not a priority for the government. For 35 years, Papuans were not the main subject of national development in their area. The granting of the 2001 special autonomy status for Papua is the government's support of the idea that Papuans be "their own masters."

In 2009, the LIPI research team (Widjojo et al., 2009) launched a book entitled "Papua Road Map Negotiating the Past Improving the Present and Securing the Future." The book was written based on the results of research on the Papua Conflict from 2004 to 2008 under the LIPI Competitive Research subprogram entitled Regional Autonomy for Conflict and Indonesian Competitiveness. The Papua Road Map (PRM) has raised some pros and cons. Some people argue that PRM was no different from other books or analyses on the Papua conflict. For example, the four main problems that the PRM stated as the source of conflict in Papua were nothing new. The four problems described in the PRM were the following: 1) marginalization and discrimination; 2) development failure; 3) state violence and human rights violations; 4) Papua's history and political status.

In a paper by Bhakti and Pigay (2012) entitled "Menemukan Akar Masalah dan Solusi atas Konflik Papua: Supenakah?", the author described the situation during the ten years (2001–2011) of implementation of the Special Autonomy Policy. This paper described and analyzed the root causes and solutions to conflict in Papua. It started by describing the social and economic conditions in Papua and the strategies to improve

these conditions. It then explained the unresolved conflict in Papua from 1963 to the present (2011). The conflict was caused by various aspects, including the conflict between the military and some Papuans, the traumatic experience endured by Papuans, especially those who have experienced military tortures, and the socio-economic conditions in Papua, which resulted in skepticism among the Papuans towards the central government. The Special Autonomy Policy for Papua, which started in 2002, has not brought security and prosperity (the social and economic rights of human beings) to Papuans. This paper concluded with the question of whether the Working Unit for the Acceleration of Development in Papua and West Papua (UP4 B) would be able to increase the capacity of the Papuan in bureaucratic and economic matters to accelerate the construction of facilities, such as airports, ports, bridges, and roads, to accelerate economic development in Papua. The most important matter is how to improve the condition of the Papuan.

Elisabeth (2012), in her article “Perdamaian dan Pembangunan Papua Problematika Politik atau Ekonomi?” revealed that Papua is a land with many paradoxes. Papua has abundant natural resources, but its people are still poor. Papua suffers from the separatist movement, but it is still developing economically. Since 2001 Papua has received a Special Autonomy status. Recently, the Government of Indonesia established the Papua and West Papua Development Acceleration Unit (UP4B) with the main objective of accelerating the development process in Papua. According to her, Papua needs a comprehensive approach as the following: 1) infrastructure and socio-economic approaches, especially the four sectors listed in the Special Autonomy Law: education, health, economy, and infrastructure; 2) security politics and culture. Peace and development are two sides of the coin for Papua. Any strategy to develop and secure Papua must be able to create economic equality, good governance, and respect for basic rights, including freedom from violence. One of the best ways to bridge the communication gap between Papua and Jakarta is through peaceful dialogue to reduce misunderstandings and prejudices that have created years of tension and conflict in Papua.

A similar paper on the issue of Papua in the context of Special Autonomy and provides a solution for peaceful dialogue is a paper by Widjojo and Budiatri (2012) entitled “UU Otonomi Khusus bagi Papua, Masalah Legitimasi dan Kemauan Politik.” According to the authors, Law No. 21 2001

on Special Autonomy Policy for Papua has failed to produce significant progress in the political and socio-economic domains. This paper focused on the process of making and legitimizing laws. The paper further stated that the socio-economic development initiated by the government since the implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy Law has not succeeded in reducing the deep-rooted and complex political conflict in Papua.

During the Papua Special Autonomy Policy implementation, a phenomenon emerged in the Papuan society, which is the strengthening of “I am native” and “you are Migrants” (I am *komen*, you are *amberi*). Gau (2014) stated that the term “migrant tribes or non-Papuan tribes” is commonly used to refer to ethnic groups from other islands, including the Javanese, Minangkabau, Madurese, Bugis, Makassarese, Toraja, Buton, Minahasa-Manado, Ternate, Tidore, Ambon, Key, and others.

In simple terms, Tebay (2009, pp. 28–29) has divided the Papuan into two groups, (1) Papuan indigenous groups, namely Papuans who have a Melanesian race, and (2) Papuan residents’ groups, namely indigenous Papuans and non-Papuans living in the Land of Papua. Akhmad (2005) also emphasized the emergence of adversary cultures based on ethnic differences in Papua. This phenomenon emphasizes the boundary between “Papuans” and “non-Papuans.” This is not a new social phenomenon in Papua. It has existed since the post-colonial era with the word “*amber*” for immigrants with straight hair and “*kamen*” for Papuans with curly hair. *Amberi* is a term used by the people of Biak and its surroundings for eastern Indonesians with Malay culture (Meteray, 2012, p. 20). The people of Biak also refer to a person that left their parents and siblings to study somewhere else and returns home with their success as *amberi* (Meteray, 2012, p. 20).

Budiatri (2017) stated that narratives about the dichotomy of Indonesian and Papuan identities marked almost every analysis of Papuan political identity. According to her, the Dutch colonial experience, the history of Papuan integration, and the failure of development during the New Order era were the key reasons for the birth of the identity division between Indonesian and Papuan in Papua. The colonial period and the New Order became the focus of her studies because the Papuan identity as the antithesis of the Indonesian identity emerged and gained traction during this era. Then what about the after the New Order? This paper shows that the dichotomy between Papuan and Indonesian identity has not been resolved despite

the implementation of several conflict resolution efforts, including the Special Autonomy Law. On the other hand, today's dichotomy of identity is even stronger and potentially can exacerbate the conflict.

The failure of the Special Autonomy Policy and other reform policies for Papua have made the disappointed Papuan see themselves as oppressed people who must consolidate to gain independence for the Papuan. This consolidation then strengthened and manifested itself in new pro-Papua referendum and pro-Papua Free movements, including the Papuan Student Alliance (Aliansi Mahasiswa Papua/AMP), the West Papua National Committee (Komite Nasional Papua Barat/KNPB), and the Papuan Democratic People's Movement (Gerakan Rakyat Demokratik Papua/Garda Papua) (Belau, 2016).

In contrast to political movement of the "older generation" that was fragmented and not solid, this new movement initiated by young Papuans seeks to affiliate and unite. This effort to unite the movement led to their affiliation to the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP), the coordinating organization of various organizations that raise Papuan issues at the international level. The ULMWP is currently seeking support from many parties abroad, especially Melanesian countries, for the Papuan referendum. It has been an observer member of the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) since June 2015. The Melanesian region is targeted by the ULMWP since they believe that Papuans are part of the Melanesian family, not part of Indonesia (Budiatri, 2017).

Papuans raise the racial issue as a differentiator from Indonesia and make them part of the Pacific countries to proclaim that they are "different from Indonesia." Papuan identity is strengthened by not just bringing up the issue of their "dislike" and "hate" the actions of the Indonesian Government and amber (immigrants) in Papua, but also the idea of Melanesian identity, which is different from Indonesian that are mostly Malays. This is an expansion of Papuan identity as the antithesis of Indonesian identity in this reform era. The formation of more solid Papuan movements signifies the revival of Papuan identity in the last decade. In the early years of the Special Autonomy Policy implementation, the Papuan identity weakened when Papuan identity was divided into several identities: the mountain people, the coastal people, and the tribal people. The emergence of the various identities was

influenced by the Special Autonomy Policy. Affirmative action during this policy implementation provided opportunities for Papuans to occupy political positions. This opportunity caused fiercer competition between ethnic Papuans, which have narrow ethnocentrism. Papuan elites who occupied important positions as bureaucrats and legislators maintained their power by placing themselves as patrons to maintain the loyalty of their constituents from their own tribe or clan (Budiatri, 2017).

Observing the mission/objectives of Special Autonomy Policy, the descriptions of researchers from the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (in the Journal of Political Research, LIPI, Vol. 9 No 1, 2012), and the social phenomenon of Papuan identity, it appears that during the first ten years of the Special Autonomy Policy implementation, there has been no solution to solving the root cause of problems in Papua. However, paying attention to the development of the use of Special Autonomy Funds from the start of the implementation until 2021, the author's observed that the Special Autonomy Funds have accelerated infrastructure development and increased community welfare. Several examples of the development were the expansion of regencies, districts, and villages; scholarships for Papuan children to continue their education to senior high school and university in Papua, outside Papua, and abroad; provision of health services for Papuans and Papua Health Cards; and indigenous Papuan regional leaders in provinces, districts, and cities.

However, violations of human rights and the issue of national integration in Papua need an immediate solution. The issue of human rights and Papua's national integration is getting stronger with international support. According to Elisabeth (2012), the issue of Papua has a strong international dimension. This issue will remain important to Indonesian politics as political violence and human rights abuses continue in Papua. The existence of multinational companies in Papua added to the international dimension of Papua issues. Although most foreign countries remain committed to supporting Indonesia's territorial integrity, Papua's future depends on how its political and economic problems are resolved. In line with the analysis of Elisabeth and Budiarti, the author believes that the omission of the issue of national integration, which is exacerbated by various human rights violations in Papua and the intervention of foreign countries, has disrupted the sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia. Like a "thorn in the flesh."

It is not enough to solve the Papua problem simply by prohibiting the flying of the Morning Star flag. The task of the government and security forces is to immediately resolve the root cause of the problems that have emerged during the thirty-eight years of Papua's integration with the Republic of Indonesia. The root cause of the problem is primarily related to the political history of the early integration of Irian Jaya with the Republic of Indonesia (Pepera 1969), which was considered to be manipulated, and the human rights violations and crimes in Papua committed by the government and security forces in more than three decades of integration that need a comprehensive resolution. And if the Papuan problem is not immediately addressed as a priority, we may be trapped in a "humanitarian tragedy," a serious threat of national disintegration (Majelis Rakyat Papua, 2020).

The research and writing of the history of Papua from the beginning of integration up to 32 years of the New Order and the granting of the special autonomy status is an example of the term "truth lies in power" (Lakatos, 1976). Now we asked ourselves, why we can be so naive? Why is it that in the past, everything seems so certain? Everything seems certain in the past because we were confined in a "totalitarian state," which not only demanded our obedience as citizens but also controlled our consciousness. Power had gradually but surely, succeeded in forming a hegemonic paradigm of truth, such as the paradigm of Thomas Kuhn. It was through this paradigm that everything must be seen, understood, and explained. The truth lies not primarily in its intrinsic value but because that is the answer imposed by the system of rationality developed by the hegemonic paradigm. In Karl Popper's logic, it is called a "lie." For the author, the historiography of Papua as the truth dominated by the authorities during the New Order era was an anomaly.

The mastery of discourse, which is supported by the lure of patronage and the threat of being seized by power, can soften it. When we woke up, we were stumbling for directions. Where is the line between of euphoria and reformation? Things are flowing fast, but we can only hope that Voltaire's cynicism will no longer plague our nation. "The only lesson in history is that people never learn from history."

In the case of Papua's national integration until the time of this study (the expansion of new autonomous regions in Papua), the narrative of the truth is the historical narrative of the government.

Ideally, after Papua becomes part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, there will be no more racial discrimination, demonstrations, cries for independence, and human rights violations. The New Order has long silenced the voices of truth, injustice, and prosperity.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The issue of Papuan National Integration remains unresolved. The government's concerns over social, economic, and political issues shown by the implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy policy for 21 years from 2001 to 2022 have not resolved the problems. The national integration issue continues to be a problem for some Papuans. Demonstrations against the New Autonomous Regions (DOB) and Special Autonomy Volume II by students and the youth are still occurring.

Learning from the history of the New Order's authoritarian and centralized ruling and the 21 years of Special Autonomy policy implementation in Papua during the Reformation era, several parties and experts have recommended several steps to resolve the issue of Papua's national integration. However, these recommendations have not produced the desired results. The government has several arguments in resolving the issue of Papua's national integration through Special Autonomy Policy.

It is an anomaly paradigm in Indonesia's history. It is an anomaly paradigm in Indonesia's history. The government must side and pay more attention to building public trust and not preserve the Papuan's "memory of violence" of the New Order regime. The biggest hope is that the division of the Papua Province into three provinces (South Papua, Central Papua, and Central Highlands Papua) can solve the problem of Papua's national integration.

#### **Acknowledgment**

The author expresses her gratitude and appreciation to the parties whose books, papers, and online media, sources were used by the author in reviewing the theme of the Special Autonomy Paradigm and National Integration in Papua. Especially to the editor-in-chief of the Bestuurskunde Journal, the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia that has raised the issue of Special Autonomy for Papua-Aceh through the journal.

## V. References

- Akhmad. (2005). *Amber dan Komin: Studi Perubahan Ekonomi di Papua*. Bigraf Publishing.
- Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. (1981). *Lembaran Berita Sejarah Lisan*. Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Bahar, S., & Tangdiling, A. B. (Eds.). (1996). *Integrasi Nasional: Teori, Masalah, dan Strategi*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Belau, A. (2016, July 27). *Refleksi 18 Tahun HUT Aliansi Mahasiswa Papua*. Suarapapua.com. <https://suarapapua.com/2016/07/27/refleksi-18-tahun-hut-aliansi-mahasiswa-papua/>
- Bhakti, I. N. (1996). *Tinjauan Empiris Integrasi Nasional Irian Jaya: Aspek Internasional*. In *Integrasi Nasional: Teori, Masalah, dan Strategi*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Bhakti, I. N., & Pigay, N. (2012). Menemukan Akar Masalah dan Solusi atas Konflik Papua: Supenakah? *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v9i1.443>
- Budiatri, A. P. (2017). Dikotomi Identitas Keindonesiaan dan Kepapuaan Pasca Orde Baru. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v14i1.712>
- Djopari, J. R. G. (1993). *Pemberontakan Organisasi Papua Merdeka*. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Elisabeth, A. (2006). Dimensi Internasional Kasus Papua. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v3i1.422>
- Elisabeth, A. (2012). Perdamaian dan Pembangunan Papua: Problematika Politik atau Ekonomi? *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v9i1.444>
- Garnaut, R. (1979). *Perubahan Sosial Ekonomi di Irian Jaya: Integrasi ke Dalam Kawasan Indonesia dan Pembangunan Ekonomi*. Gramedia.
- Garraghan, G. J. (1957). *A Guide to Historical Method* (J. Delanglez, Ed.). Fordham UP.
- Gau, S. (2014). Selayang Pandang Diaspora Buton di Papua: Antara Ruang dan Bahasa. *Telaga Bahasa: Jurnal Ilmiah Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan*, 2(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.36843/tb.v2i1.9>
- Gottschalk, L. (1986). *Mengerti Sejarah* (R. P. N. Notosusanto, Trans.). UI Press.
- Hendrowinoto, N. K. S. (1998). *Acub Zainal, I Love the Army*. Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lakatos, I. (1976). Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. In S. G. Harding (Ed.), *Can Theories be Refuted?* (pp. 205–259). Springer Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1863-0\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1863-0_14)
- Leirissa, R. Z., Ohorella, G. A., Haryono, P. S., & Wasith, M. (1992). *Sejarah Proses Integrasi Irian Jaya*. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. <http://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/id/eprint/14102>
- Majelis Rakyat Papua. (2013). *Implementasi Otonomi Khusus Papua dan Papua Barat dalam Pengalaman Empirik Orang Asli Papua: Laporan Hasil Evaluasi Otonomi Khusus Papua dan Papua Barat*. Majelis Rakyat Papua.
- Majelis Rakyat Papua. (2020). *Efektivitas Implementasi Undang-Undang Nomor 21 Tahun 2001 tentang Otonomi Khusus bagi Papua Selama 20 Tahun Terakhir dalam Berbagai Bidang Kehidupan*.
- Mashad, D., & Bhakti, I. N. (1999). Berbagai Faktor Separatisme di Irian Jaya. In *Indonesia di Ambang Perpecahan? Kasus Aceh, Riau, Irian Jaya, dan Timor Timur*. Penerbit Erlangga.
- Meteray, B. (2012). *Nasionalisme Ganda Orang Papua*. Kompas Media Nusantara.
- Pekey, F. (2018). *Papua Mencari Jalan Perdamaian: Telaah Konflik dan Resolusi di Bumi Cenderawasih*. Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Penggu, S. (2002). *Papua Berdarah*. AMP Internasional.
- Popper, K. R. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Hutchinson.
- Rianda, B., Djemat, Y. O., & Rahmat, A. N. (2017). Kebijakan Luar Negeri Indonesia terhadap Dukungan Republik Vanuatu atas Kemerdekaan Papua Barat Tahun 2015–2016. *Dinamika Global: Jurnal Ilmu Hubungan Internasional*, 02(01), 82–113. <https://doi.org/10.36859/jdg.v2i01.33>
- Singarimbun, M., & Effendi, S. (Eds.). (1983). *Metode Penelitian Survei*. LP3ES.

- Sjamsuddin, N. (1989). *Integrasi Politik di Indonesia*. Gramedia.
- Solossa, J. P. (2005). *Otonomi Khusus: Mengangkat Martabat Rakyat Papua di dalam NKRI*. Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Sumule, A. (Ed.). (2003). *Mencari Jalan Tengah: Otonomi Khusus Provinsi Papua*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Tebay, N. (2009). *Dialog Jakarta-Papua: Sebuah Perspektif Papua*. Sekretariat Keadilan dan Perdamaian, Keuskupan Jayapura.
- Widjojo, M. S., & Budiatri, A. P. (2012). UU Otonomi Khusus bagi Papua: Masalah Legitimasi dan Kemauan Politik. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v9i1.449>
- Widjojo, M. S., Elizabeth, A., Al Rahab, A., Pamungkas, C., & Dewi, R. (2009). *Papua Road Map: Negotiating the Past, Improving the Present, and Securing the Future*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Yambeyapdi, E. (2016). Ten Years of Papua Integration With the Republic of Indonesia From 1963 to 1973. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 10(9), 39–45.
- Yambeyapdi, E. (2018). Papua: Sejarah Integrasi yang Diingat dan Ingatan Kolektif. *IHiS (Indonesian Historical Studies)*, 2(2), 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.14710/ihis.v2i2.3749>
- Zuhdi, S. (2018). Kesultanan Bacan, Ingatan Kolektif, dan Rekonstruksi Sejarah Kontemporer Indonesia. In R. S. Hidayat (Ed.), *Hakikat Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.