

Dr. Bambang Suparno, S.H, M.HUM

Indonesia

THE PROBLEMATIC SPECIAL AUTONOMY IMPLEMENTATION IN PAPUA

Indonesia is a pluralistic country which has many differences. These differences will cause the existence of chaotic problems if the government does not take optimal actions. Papua and Nangroe Aceh Darussalam (NAD) often face conflicts between ethnic groups, religion and economic discrepancy. Thus, these areas separated themselves from Indonesia. The Legislations No.32/2004 about district government autonomy concerns the difficulties of implementing autonomy. Hence, regional and special autonomy in Indonesia is hard to be implemented. This study aims to observe the criteria of special autonomy in Papua, the problems in implementing special autonomy in Papua and the separation of Papua from Indonesia in international view. This study applied descriptive research design. The result showed that the Indonesian government must improve the life of Papua residents. Special autonomy should not only be implemented in Papua and Aceh but also in every region as long as the government can guarantee the improvement of their welfare and prosperity.

Keywords: special autonomy, Papua, conflict, freedom.

1. Introduction

The world's nations have known Papua's civilization since 13 century through the trading mission of America, Europe, China, India and Asia, including the national kingdoms such as Majapahit, Sri Wijaya and Tidore. Since that, many countries' surveyor saw Papua's natural resources such as tropical forests, fisheries, mines and oil. In 1907, Dutch exploited oil in Papua and made it as horizontal and vertical conflict. Two years before the referendum, Papua got support from the USA and its allies. Papua's independence got United Nations consideration to be free from Indonesia's authority (United Nation Resolution no.2504, 19th October 1969 and autonomy legislations no.12/1969).

Indonesia has about 17.480 islands that make it the biggest archipelago country in the world with abundant natural resources. The extent of Indonesia territory is approximately 7.7 million km², where the two-thirds are the sea. Therefore, Indonesia is the second longest coastline in the world after Canada with about 95.181 km length. Geographically, Indonesia has a very strategic position which is between two continents (Asia and Australia), and two oceans (Indian and Pacific Ocean), in which those places are very dynamic areas of the world in either economic or political point.

Papua is an island placed in northern Australia and eastern Indonesia. More than 71% of its areas are still in the form of hard tropical forest, steeped valleys and snowy high mountains. The potential area of Papua is about 421.981 km with only 2.3 million populations. However, behind those limestone mountains, there are mineral resources that may produce 77\$ billion. Those copper and golden mountains have been there since million years ago.

The indigene people are known as Papuan, wandered in the valleys and mountains to trade. In 1936, a Dutch named Jean Jacques Dozy, climbed the glacier and found pasturage without trees and named it as *Grasberg*. Dozy reported his discovery in his research published in the geological journal in Leiden (*leidsche geologische mededeelingen*). However, it was less interesting than *Ertsberg* found by Netherland in 1936, the highest copper and golden level in the world. *Ertsberg* is also being the magnet for Freeport to come to Papua which proverbially "*Honey's escort to invite the ants*". Thus, this study offered some cases related to the criteria of special autonomy in Papua, the problems occurred in implementing special autonomy in Papua and the separation of Papua issue from Indonesia in international view.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Papua History

In 1760, Netherland acknowledged the Tidore authority over Papua. Then, Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles in "the convention of 1814" strengthened the Tidore's right acknowledgment over Papua. In 1814,

Papua is included into Ternate kingdom under the Dutch colonialism named Dutch East Indie which later became Indonesia. Papua is the second largest island in the world after Greenland, Denmark with 890.000 km². In other words, about 47% of Papua's width is included to Indonesia, named as Papua New Guinea; England ex colonialized. Actually, the population of Indonesia and Papua has ethnical relation which is unfortunately separated by a borderline. It is signed by 141 longitudes east from north to south. Papua indigenes were from Asia's land that was migrated by ship.

The European colonials who firstly visited Papua called the indigenes as *Melanesia* people. The word *Melanesia* was derived from Greece word 'Mela' which means black, because of their skin. Geographical expert, Claudius Ptolemaeus (Ptolamy) named Papua as *Labadios* and nobody knows why. Around 500 century, Chinese named them *Tungki*. This could be known by a Chinese daily writer named Ghau Yu Kuan. He described that spices Chinese got were from Tungki which later was used for Papua's name.

Then, South East Asia and Portuguese interacted with them very close and called them as Papua. In the 18th century, the Sriwijaya kingdom, centered in Palembang called Papua as Janggi. Srwijaya sent several *Cenderawasih* birds to China that was believed as heaven's bird originally from Papua known as "Jenggi"¹.

At the end of 1300, Majapahit used two names, Wanin and Sram. Wanina was derived from Onin peninsula in Fak-Fak region while Sram was from Seram Island, Maluku. Papua was also included in Majapahit kingdom based on Nagarakertagama book (a history book). Then, a history that mentioned Papua was included into Majapahit was also written in Prapanca book in 1365. The Kertagama book written by a poet, Mpu Prapanca, explained that "Tugki" or "Jenggi" were derived from Chinese trader named Chun Tjok Kwan. In around 1464, Tidore kingdom named the people of the island as Papa-Ua which later changed into Papua.

In 700, traders from Persia, India and Gujarat started to come to Papua. Their aim was to find spices after seeing the Chinese traders succeed in Papua. These traders called Papua as *Dwi Panta* and *Samudranta*, which mean ocean and sea edge. Even though there were controversies about the histories, it actually emphasized the inseparable parts of Mojopahit's kingdom authority under Asia's kingdoms link.

In 1511, Antonio d'Arbau originated from Portuguese called Papua as "Os Papuas" or "Ilha de Papo". In addition, Don Jorge de Menetes (1526-1527) originated from Spain called Papua. He knew Papua from the daily notes of Antonio Figafetta, a writer of the Magelhaens sailing to travel the world. In 1528, Alvaro de Savedra, the chief of Spain fleet named Papua with *Papua Isla Del Oro* or Island of Gold. As the result, hectic European sailors went to Papua passionately to find gold. It was proven by the coming of a Spain sailor, Inigo Ortiz Retes in 1545. He named Papua as Nueva Guinee because he saw Africans' people characteristic, named Guinea, in there. This name was used by the outside world, especially by Europeans for almost two centuries.

The last development of Papua historical name was from Biak Language, "Iri" which means land and "an" which means hot. Therefore, Irian name means hot land. Then, the further investigation has shown the similar meaning as Serui and Merauke areas. In Serui language, "Iri" means land while "an" means nation so that Irian means the land of a nation. Meanwhile, in Merauke language, "Iri" means placed high while "an" means nation so that Irian means the Nation placed high. In 16th July 1946, Frans Kaisepo represented New Guinea in Malino-Ujung Pandang conference, replaced Papua and New Guinea with Irian through national radio officially. Frans Kaisepo stated "*The changing of Papua name to be Irian, because of historical meaning contained of strive spirit: IRIAN means Ikut Republik Indonesia Anti Netherland (following the republic of Indonesia Anti-Netherland)*"².

After Indonesia's independence in 1945, Netherland could not defend Papua as the colonialized place. On 1st May, 1963 Papua was officially owned by Indonesia. Meanwhile, the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) prepared an act of free choice to use two names for Papua. Those were West New Guinea or West Irian. In 1967, Freeport McMorran Ltd and Indonesia government had cooperation agreement contract. The world had declared that Papua was a part of Indonesia stated in the Society's Opinion Determination (PEPERA) in 1969. Then, 1st March 1973 as stated no.5/1973, West Irian was changed into Irian Jaya by Soeharto. In the Reformation era, the society insisted to change Irian name into Papua as the Indonesia medium instruction.

¹ Bachtiar, Harsja W. (1963). Sejarah Irian Barat. Penduduk Irian Barat (ed.). *Koentjaraningrat and Harsja W. Bachtiar*. P.T. Penerbitan Universitas.

² Sayidiman, Suryohadiprojo (2005). *Si Vis Pacem Parabellum (Membangun Pertahanan Negara yang Efektif dan Modern)*. Jakarta: PT.Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

2.2 Special autonomy

Legislations No.21/2001 about Papua's special autonomy mandated the changing name to be Papua. In 2003, many protests occurred about combining central and east Papua. Papua was divided into two provinces by Indonesia government. The eastern part has the same name as previous while the western become West Irian Jaya (one year later become west Papua). The eastern part is now becoming the Papua province while West Papua is still being used by OPM (Papua independence organization) a separation movement to be apart from Indonesia.

Special autonomy for Papua Province was given through Legislations no.23/2014 Clause 339 about regional government dividing into several special regions including Papua. The 1945 Legislations clause 18A (1) and 18 B (1) explained that Indonesia acknowledges and respects the special and preferential characterized region. Furthermore, Legislations no.21/2001 (government gazette in 2001 no.135 and additional government gazette no.4151), which has been changed by Interim government regulation no.1/2008 (government gazette no.57 and additional government gazette no.4843). Legislation no. 21/2001 has ruled Papua province authorization on special autonomy operation in Republic of Indonesia frame.

Special autonomy fund must have each allocation. For instance, a regional government must allocate about 15% autonomy fund for health, nutrition improvement and prosperity per year. 47.9 trillion Rupiahs had been allocated from 2002 until 2016. In other words, 7.18 trillion rupiahs had been allocated for Papua's nutrition improvement. Recently, the government focuses on infrastructures on road for Trans Papua with 1.719,46 KM length, harbor and airport in Yahukimo and Wamena (West Papua) and several dams in Manokwari and Oransbari. However, Papua's revenue is always growing gradually and periodically. It had been increasing about 57% in 15 years from 1.38 trillion in 2002 to 5.39 trillion in 2017. Therefore, the special autonomy fund for Papua has to be investigated, particularly for the effectiveness. Moreover, this fund distribution will be ended in 2021 while Indonesia Revision Budget (APBN) draft of Papua and West Papua fund achieve 8 trillion (70% for Papua and 30% for West Papua). In 2018, the fund is increasing 8.03 trillion (Ministry of Finance, Indonesia)

2.3 The criteria for giving special autonomy in Papua

Indonesia is an archipelago country that consists of various ethnic, races, religion, belief, culture and other differences. In other words, Indonesia is a pluralistic country. These differences will cause the existence of chaotic problems if the government does not take optimal action; Papua and Nangroe Aceh Darussalam (NAD) cases, for instance. These two areas often face conflicts between ethnic groups, religion and economic development discrepancy. As the result, these areas separated themselves from Indonesia.

The central government gave special autonomy to Papua and Aceh to maintain the wholeness of Indonesia Republic. This decision is valid based on Clause 18B, The 1945 Legislations. It declared that Indonesia acknowledges and respects every region with special autonomy. Additionally, it is also seen in clause 225 on Legislations no.32/2004 about regional government as to special autonomy regional government.

The people's consultative assembly (MPR) had decreed the need of Irian Jaya to be given special autonomy as mandated in MPR no. IV/MPR/1999 about State Policy Guidelines in 1999-2004, Chapter IV (g) no.2. In addition, another regulation MPR no. IV/2000 about policy recommendation in regional autonomy implementation emphasized the importance of special autonomy realization through determining special autonomy legislation in Irian Jaya by considering the people's aspiration. Indeed, it is one of the positive ways to create the public trust and to solve problems in Papua.

Special autonomy, based on Legislations no.21/2001 about special autonomy for Papua province in Chapter 1 Clause, means special authority acknowledged and gives Papua to rule and manage Papua's society based on their rights and aspiration. The purpose of giving special autonomy in Papua is to manifest justice, law supremacy enforcement, human rights honorary, economic development and advance and Papua's society prosperity. Special autonomy, by Legislations no.21/2001, places Papua indigenes and population as the main subjects. Papua indigenes were those from Melanesia race which includes the origin people from Papua while people staying in Papua are those who live in Papua.

Aceh is one of Indonesia provinces that have special autonomy since 2001 based on Legislations no.18/2001 about special autonomy in Nangroe Aceh Darussalam province. Nangroe Aceh Darussalam was the most tempestuous province in Indonesia. Since the independent day, Aceh had expected to get special treatment by the government. This expectation was striven for several important reasons, from the important one and the strongest reason was history.

The criteria of Special autonomy in Papua are the following:

a. Considering the existence of West Irian Jaya which later changed to be West Papua Province factually had run the government and development matter and had served the society since 2003, but the special autonomy based on the Regulation no.21/2001 had not been implemented.

b. The implementation of special autonomy in West Papua Province need the law assurance, hence there were no any obstacles on development acceleration, particularly to social, economy, politics and infrastructure in West Papua Province.

c. Based on the Alphabet “a” and “b” consideration, it needed the draft replacement government rules decreed, about the Legislations no.21 2001 to Papua province special autonomy.

2.4 Separation issue

Papua, in United Nations, faces a new phase not only because the international law brought Papua case in term of public council session but also because the Papua case includes the cases of human right violation and life aspect of development. Regarding to this, the government had answered by responding the statement from Vanuatu and Solomon islands in United Nation’s public council session on 25th September 2017. The point was government still emphasized the politic position to Papua, in which Papua is still included as the Republic of Indonesia.

3. Research methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study used a qualitative descriptive approach in Gunawan¹ stated that this approach was specifically tied to factual social relation from world’s life plurality. This method was applied to see and comprehend the research subject and object including persons and institutions based on the factual data. This method would reveal the actualization, social reality and perception about research target. Qualitative research was meant to comprehend the human behavior about how the doer saw and interpreted the activity based on his principle. The researcher tried to understand and to describe the research’s subject. Qualitative research is based on how a researcher built a point of view.

3.2 Research location

This research was conducted in Papua that aimed to observe the problems of special autonomy implementation.

3.3 Research subject

Arikunto² stated that research subject was the aimed subject to be researched. Thus, research subject is the information source to get the facts. The subject of this study was the researcher himself. Meanwhile, the objects were Papua’s residents and government.

3.4 Data Source

3.4.1 Primary data

Based on Sugiyono³ primary source is the data source which directly provides data for a researcher. The primary data source of this study was through field observation in Papua.

3.4.2 Secondary data

According to Sugiyono⁴, secondary data is indirect data source such as data from other persons or documents. The sources were from books, papers or other relevant documents.

3.5 Data collecting technique

Sugiyono⁵, explained that there are three techniques of collecting data:

3.5.1 Observation

According to Kartono⁶ in Gunawan⁷, observation is a systematic and deliberate study about a social phenomenon and psychological symptoms by observing and noting. This research used observation as an activity that done through direct observation. It was about the special autonomy implementation problem in Papua.

¹ Gunawan, Imam. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 81.

² Arikunto, Suharsimi (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 165.

³ Sugiyono (2014). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 137.

⁴ Sugiyono (2014). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 137.

⁵ Sugiyono (2014). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 62.

⁶ Kartono, Kartini (1980). *Pengantar Metodologi Riset Sosial*. Alumni Bandung, 142.

⁷ Gunawan, Imam (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 143.

3.5.2 Interview

Interview is a direct conversation between two or more people focusing on a particular problem¹. In this case, the researcher interviewed the residents of Papua and its government.

3.5.3 Document

Document was noted events, whether written, image or monumental work from a person². In this study, the researcher documented the research's result by written description.

4. Result and discussion

Regional Autonomy

Autonomy is a united by law society, that has a certain region to rule and to deal government and residents matters, based on the society's aspiration in Indonesia.

Special Autonomy

The regulation about special autonomy is determined in the Legislation no.32/2004 in Clause 225. It emphasizes the state acknowledgment of regions with special autonomy. Indonesia has two provinces with special autonomy, Aceh and Papua. Based on Clause 1 B Legislations no.21/2001 about special autonomy in Papua mentioned that the special autonomy means giving special authority to a certain region to rule and to manage the society's matters based on the society's aspiration and right. Another function of special autonomy is to maintain the country's unity because society's necessity and prosperity criteria are different.

Implementing Special autonomy in Papua was meant to achieve justice, law supremacy enforcement, human right respect, economic development, Papua society's prosperity in term of balancing with other regions. Based on the Legislations no.21/2001, special autonomy place Papua indigenes and Papua residents as the main subject. Papua's indigenes are Melanesian race including original tribes or the residents who accept Papua customs. Whereas Papua's residents are people living in the Papua province. However, there are fundamental criteria to implement special autonomy, such as: history, different necessity, different condition and other criteria indicating a region to be special. In fact, there were problems in case of implementing special autonomy in Papua. One of the problems was the existence of armed conflict and violence.

Regarding the special autonomy in Papua, its implementation could not be stated as a public agreement but it was instead the central government's way to handle the problem in Papua. As the result, the public, especially those in conflict, could not understand the existence of special autonomy implementation. Moreover, the society considered special autonomy given to Papua as a way to stop their fight while the central government considered the implementation of special autonomy as the solution to solve conflicts in Papua. However, there are partial societies who involved themselves in forming special autonomy and accepted it as an effort to create peace in Papua. In substantial point of view, the Legislation of special autonomy had given a huge portion for Papua. Unfortunately, instead, it became one of the conflict sources, particularly when it was not implemented consistently. Commonly, rights, authorizations and obligations of Papua was limited, reduced or even pulled back to the central through operational and sectorial legislation. Some partnership studies on special autonomy in Papua (2008) showed the society's dissatisfaction toward the implementation of special autonomy in Papua. Those studies identified some ineffectiveness of special autonomy implementation in Papua, as followed:

a. Several substances in special autonomy legislation emerged unsolved conflict between Papua and government, such as regional sign and flag. Although the flag and sign existence was acknowledged on Clause 2 verse 2 Legislations no.21/2001, there were no further steps undertaken and tended to be blocked by the government instead. The police and Indonesian National Armed Forces refused the *Kejora* flag rising.

b. Political dimension in Papua's conflict was stronger than prosperity built in the implementation. Special autonomy was more fulfilled with a political event such as region expansion, demonstration, special autonomy return, and regional election. The efforts to better the society's life were extremely obscure.

c. The formulation of special autonomy regulation was not as fast as the fund disbursement. The regulation was finished 3 years after the special autonomy had been implemented. Whereas, the fund

¹ Kartono, Kartini (1980). *Pengantar Metodologi Riset Sosial*. Alumni Bandung, 171; Gunawan, Imam (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 160.

² Sugiyono (2014). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 396.

disbursement was released since 2002. Unfortunately, the funding disbursement did not guarantee the increasing of the Papuans living standard. Otherwise, it was abused to be corrupted by the Papuans elite.

d. The special autonomy evaluation actually ought to be done annually as mandated on special autonomy legislation. Hence, the society could not fulfill their rights holistically because the funding was misused by government bureaucracy;

e. Special autonomy had been indeed informed to all Papua society but it was not well-informed. The society generally knew about special autonomy but they could not understand it. In fact, special autonomy is a dis-participatory policy and a perspective run from the government.

Implementation Problems

There were several causes of the special autonomy implementation failure, which are:

a. First, special autonomy implementation was not run along with political conflict resolution. It caused a polarized-political situation in special autonomy implementation done either by the central government or by social groups in Papua. Special autonomy moved to be political issues. It was contradicted to real programs aimed to increase the Papuans living standard as the special autonomy policies. The central government was still using safety approach that was not in line with the special autonomy goals.

b. Second, safety approach was shown to be violated from the mandated decree which includes the protection and appreciation to moral, ethics, human rights fulfillment, law supremacy, democracy, pluralism and the equality to be Indonesia's citizens. All violation showed partial special autonomy roles in manifesting its function. Also, there were still untrusted reasons to government in Papua.

c. Third, there were tendency to undermine the special autonomy by strengthening central government pattern. It could be shown from the President Instruction no.21/2003 about the Papua province regional expansion in Legislations no.45/1999 which was actually contradicted with Legislations no.21/2001. Papua's special autonomy undermining has happened at various kinds of decentralized policies that were not based on Legislations no.21/2001, but rather used Legislations no.32/2004 pointed on city or town level that emerged the conflict between the regional governments.

d. Fourth, there was a minus institutional capability to run the special autonomy, either legally formal or particular political situation. For instance, the existence of Papua Society Council or MRP which was cultural representative unable to fulfill the policies and control government's implementation. Besides, there must be infrastructure parties of local politics to cover the Papuan's aspiration. In fact, it has not been implemented yet.

e. Fifth, there were indications of slowing the special autonomy implementation. Based on the partnership research, there were, at the very least, minimum 2 government regulations, 2 president decrees, 13 special regional regulations and 21 province regional regulations had not been made. Whereas, those were the fundamental special autonomy achievement such as the Papuans rights appreciation in natural resources management, human rights protection, also participation in the government implementation.

The Obstacles and Shortcomings in special autonomy implementation

Papua special autonomy legislation was a policy or regulation given by central government to increase the development on an aspect with four main priority aspects such as economy, education, health and infrastructure. Philosophically, this special autonomy legislation was made to align their position with other regions. It was also to fulfill their basic human rights protection as Papuan indigenes since their integration to the Republic of Indonesia was ignored and marginalized. Shortly, the goal of special autonomy was to the huge prosperity for Papuans. However, the special autonomy implementation was not run optimally due to many kinds of obstacles, as followed:

1. Unclear authorization and fund distribution
2. Papua regional government and central inconsistency.
3. The interests and authorizations Papua's local elite conflict

Separation issues

The Papua separation effort mainly was through three strategies: (1) the against movement by OPM (Papua independent organization) such demonstrations by college students, (2) Papua's international and political issues, for instance the United Liberation Movement of West Papua (ULMWP) inauguration official office which campaigned about human right violation, oppression and injustice suffered by Papuan,

and (3) the urgent referendum about Papua society owned fate direction. Papua referendum strategy through United Nation Council was similar to the strategy of Timor's separation from Indonesia.

Since then, the government tends not to respond to the countries which support the separation. For instance, when the Free West Papua's office was opened by Benny Wenda, its figure, in Oxford in April 2013, the government only asked clarification. Whereas, the United Kingdom government did not give any comment to the opening of the office. In fact, the official ceremony of ULWMP in Wamena is covered and ignored by the government. The government will increase the relation between Melanesia countries instead. All parties, particularly the government, actually have to have a solution to unite and strengthen the state.

In 1998, there was a recommendation from *Rand Corporation*, a strategy institution which used to give a recommendation to USA Ministry of Defense, recommending that Indonesia must be divided into eight regions. One of the priority regions was Papua. It was revealed by Hendrajit, et.al in America's puppet (USA Invisible operation in the world) book, published by Global Future Institute in 2010. Through this, the separation was clearly an effort from foreigners.

The Papua Independent Organization (OPM) tried to get support other advanced countries, such as Europe, Asia Pacific and Australia. The movement in Asian Pacific, although in Pacific Island Forum (KTT PIF), the Melanesian countries have acknowledged the Indonesia authority over Papua. Yet, the case raised in Papua about human rights violation in PIF was actually being the big note for our country's diplomats.

In 22th of December 2012, there was conducted meeting between Netherland's parliament and the government about Papua's issue. Oridek AP, before the meeting was begun, announced that it was the success of his effort to separate Papua from Indonesia. Unfortunately, the Netherland's foreign minister stated that their nation would not leap Indonesia's authority over Papua. They also would like to try to find the solution through the diplomacy relation.

In addition on 28th of June 2014, on National Veterans Day in Den Haag, Netherland, a Papua youth born in Netherland and led by Oridek AP, Iskandar Bwefar, was caught by Netherland Police because he recklessly brought the *Kejora* flag. Whereas, the Netherlands have never prohibited displaying the *Kejora* flag in the Netherlands.

Furthermore, the English government, in the House of Lords, had a conversation with the Minister of Commonwealth, Malloch Brown. Malloch Brown stated that the English government would not have interest on the Papua's problem in United Nation council forum. England respected the territorial integrity of Indonesia. England also believed that special autonomy legislation were the best way to solve the problems for Papua. Other best ways were to promote peaceful dialogue between the Indonesia government and Papua groups.

Besides, the Germany delegation for human rights and humanity help, Christopher Strasser, explained that European would not support Papua separation from Indonesia. He emphasized that Germany would always support Indonesia's integration. However, the Indonesian government should continuously take care of Papua's prosperity. Indonesia should also improve Papua's living much better with no discriminations on any aspects.

Conclusion

Indeed, the existence of special autonomy implementation in Papua one of the government's ways to unite the state and to improve the prosperity, particularly in Papua. Thus, there are some criteria needed to implement special autonomy in Papua, such as history, regional needs, and regional situation and so on. However, the implementation of special autonomy in Papua faced several problems and obstacles. First, the existence of national policy in the form of Legislation was not in line with the Legislation of special autonomy in Indonesia. Second, there were several state institutions that did not understand the implementation of special autonomy in Indonesia which then cause a policy crash. In fact, the problems were not only coming from the central government but also regional officers, such regional officers could not catch the philosophical point and the Legislation content of special autonomy implemented in Papua. Hence, the implementation of special autonomy in Papua should also consider the philosophical, sociological, political and juridical aspects.

Besides, there are international countries that did not support the separation of Papua from Indonesia, such as the Netherlands, England, and Germany. This was because they respect Indonesia integrity, so the implementation of special autonomy in Papua was the exact solution to unite the state.

References:

1. Arikunto, Suharsimi (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta . [in Indonesian].
2. Azmi, Muttaqin (2014). *Otonomi Khusus Papua Sebuah Upaya Merespon Konflik Dan Aspirasi Kemerdekaan Papua*. Bandung: Ejournal Undip. [in Indonesian].
3. Gunawan, Imam. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara. [in Indonesian].
4. Bachtiar, Harsja W. (1963). Sejarah Irian Barat. Penduduk Irian Barat (ed.). *Koentjaraningrat and Harsja W. Bachtiar*. P.T. Penerbitan Universitas. [in Indonesian].
5. Kartono, Kartini (1980). *Pengantar Metodologi Riset Sosial*. Alumni Bandung. [in Indonesian].
6. Muchamad Ali, Safa'at (2014). Problem Otonomi Khusus Papua. Malang. *Jurnal Universitas Brawijaya*. <<http://safaat.lecture.ub.ac.id/files/2014/03/PROBLEM-OTONOMI-KHUSUS-PAPUA.pdf>> [in Indonesian].
7. Sayidiman, Suryohadiprojo (2005). *Si Vis Pacem Parabellum (Membangun Pertahanan Negara yang Efektif dan Modern)*. Jakarta: PT.Gramedia Pustaka Utama [in Indonesian].
8. Sugiyono (2014). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung: Alfabeta. [in Indonesian].
9. Masalah Otonomi Khusus Papua. <<http://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/detail/lt4e8c3cabba8dc/masalah-otonomi-khusus-papua>>. [in Indonesian].
10. Negara-negara Eropa Dukung Pemisahan Papua dari Indonesia(?). <<https://www.kompasiana.com/evha.uaga/56014e2e1fafbd21048b4567/negara-negara-eropa-dukung-pemisahan-papua-dari-indonesia>>. [in Indonesian].
11. Setelah 14 Tahun, Otonomi Khusus Papua Masih Alami Kendala. <<http://www.unpad.ac.id/2015/03/setelah-14-tahun-otonomi-khusus-papua-masih-alami-kendala/>>. [in Indonesian].
12. Makalah Otonomi Khusus Dalam negara kesatuan Republik Indonesia. <<http://klinikmelekhukum.blogspot.com/2016/09/makalah-otonomi-khusus-dalam-negara.html>> [in Indonesian].
13. Upaya Pemisahan Papua, Apakah Merupakan 'Trik' Selanjutnya?. <<http://www.voa-islam.com/read/citizens-journalism/2016/03/19/42912/upaya-pemisahan-papua-apaakah-merupakan-trik-selanjutnya/#sthash.KpV12tJE.dpbs>>. [in Indonesian].