



Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences

Journal Homepage: <https://journalsocialsciences.com/index.php/OAIJSS>

Building an Integrated Food Estate to Realize Territorial Resilience in Papua

Beni Rudiawan^{1*}, Amarulla Octavian², Rizerius Eko Hadi Sancoko², Wayan Nuriada³, Buddy Suseto⁴, Martinus Dwi Arjanto Widodo², Endah Sri Rejeki²

¹ Defense Management Research Center, Institute for Research and Community Service (LP2M), Indonesia Defense University, Bogor, Indonesia

² Indonesia Defense University, Bogor, Indonesia

³ Center of Relevance and Education Management (LP3M), Indonesia Defense University, Bogor, Indonesia

⁴ Study Program of Marine Defense Strategy, Indonesia Defense University, Bogor, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Integrated Food Estate
Territorial Resilience
High Social Gap
Discrimination

*Corresponding author:

Beni Rudiawan

E-mail address:

benirudiawan3287@gmail.com

All authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

<https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijss.v4i2.60>

ABSTRACT

The problem of the high social gap in Papua, which is the cause of marginalization and discrimination against the Papuan people, and the different perceptions of some Indonesians at home and abroad towards armed separatist conflicts are push factors to corner the Indonesian government. In addition, the issue of internationalization of the 1969 referendum mechanism, violations of human rights, and the management of natural resources by multinational companies that do not have an impact on improving the welfare of the Papuan people also complement the opinion of the government's failure. Against the background of these problems, this study uses a quasi-qualitative research method. We collected research data through focus group discussions (FGD), in-depth interviews, and direct discussions with various informants (academics, practitioners, bureaucracy, and community leaders), completed with literature review as secondary data. The results of this study recommend the development of an Integrated Food Estate (IFE) in stages according to customary areas in Papua, which will indirectly support the realization of territorial resilience and the Universal Defense System (Sishta). In conclusion, with all implementation of recommendations, it is hoped the completion of peaceful and prosperous Papuan people will come true.

1. Introduction

Based on various publications and opinions that develop among the Indonesian and international community regarding the handling of the conflict in Papua, in the end, it creates contradictions and different perceptions. It leads to the presupposition of efforts to marginalize and discriminate Papuans in the life of the nation and state in Indonesia. Historically, the existence of the Papua region has indeed become a Dutch colonial colony as written in Article 1 of the Constitution of the Netherland in 1938, which states that Netherland New Guinea (West Papua) is part of the Dutch East Indies. The

claim of the Indonesian government regarding the independence of all Indonesian sovereign territory on August 17, 1945, did not necessarily make the Dutch surrender the territory of Papua.

The struggle of the Indonesian government to liberate the entire region from the shackles of colonialism was not only carried out with a challenging power approach but also a mediation power approach with the involvement of the United Nations as a mediator, and there were several meetings between the Indonesian and Dutch governments, including: Malino Conference on July 18, 1946, was attended by Frans Kaisepo as a



representative of the Papuan people. In the same year, Martin Indyk proposed the establishment of the Independent Indonesia Commission (KIM), and the momentum for the raising of the Red and White flag on Buru Island by Major Johannes A. Dimara as a form of Papuan people's nationalism towards the Republic of Indonesia; The Three Nations Commission, which was held on August 25, 1947, was an attempt by the United Nations (UN) Security Council to mediate (arbitrate) issues between Indonesia and the Netherlands, which still did not want to hand over all their colonies. The United Nations appointed Australia (represented by Richard C. Kirby) as the representative of Indonesia, America (represented by Frank B. Graham) as a neutral party and Belgium (represented by Paul Van Zeeland) as the representative of the Netherlands. This commission resulted in the holding of the Renville Agreement on December 8, 1947. On the other hand, as a form of nationalism, Silas Papare's attempt to raise the Red and White flag in Papua as a commemoration of Independence Day on August 17, 1947, resulted in the Dutch military's arrest; and The Round Table Conference (KMB), which was held from August 23 to November 2, 1949, in Den Haag, Netherlands, and attended by Silas Papare as a representative from Indonesia, actually made the Papua "a pending matter" region to be handed over from Netherlands to Indonesia because the people were still underdeveloped, impoverished and difference in race between Papuans and Indonesians in other areas. In addition, The Dutch people also have another interest. They want to control Papua's natural resources, especially copper and gold.

Based on these negotiations, it did not dampen the attitude of the Dutch government to immediately surrender all of Indonesia's territory even though on August 17, 1956, the Indonesian government formed the province of Papua and made Soasiu in Tidore the capital, which was more a form of protest to the Dutch. The post-World War 2 situation, which left many problems related to the colonized region or country including its people, made the United Nations issue resolution Number 1514 Declaration on The Granting Independence to Colonial Countries

and Peoples, which was signed on December 14, 1960, to guarantee independence for the nations. in colonialism. However, a year later, on December 1, 1961, the Dutch formed the Papuan Council (Nieu Guinea Raad), which consisted of Papuans who were still loyal to the Dutch kingdom, and they often carried out propaganda that the Indonesian government had not been able to improve the welfare of the Papuan people.

The attitude of the Dutch government, which still insisted and did not want to give up Papua, incited the people, and even formed the Papuan Council had made President Soekarno on December 19, 1961, in the Yogyakarta square announce that a military operation was carried out to seize Papua with the code name "Operation Tri Komando Rakyat. (Trikorra) which contains: failed the formation of the Dutch-made Papuan Puppet State; raise the Indonesian flag in West Irian (Papua), and carry out general mobilization to defend the independence and unity of the homeland and the nation.

2. Literature Review

Military operations supported by Presidential Decree (Keppres) No. 1/1962 contained an order that to reclaim the territory of Papua from the Dutch colonialists, an Operation to Seize West Irian was carried out from December 19, 1961, to August 15, 1962, with the Commander of the Mandala, Major General TNI Suharto. The protracted conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia over the Papua issue caused the United Nations to take diplomatic steps by bringing the two sides together in New York, the United Nations headquarters.

From the results of the meeting, the New York Agreement was born, which was signed on August 15, 1962, by Dr. Subandrio from the Indonesian government, and the Dutch side represented by J.H. Van Roijen with the points of agreement, namely: The Netherlands handed over administrative responsibility for the administration of West Papua to the United Nations through the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA); as of May 1, 1963, UNTEA handed over West Papua to Indonesia; at the end of 1969, under the supervision of the



United Nations, the Act of Free Choice was carried out for the Papuan people to determine their destiny or independence.

The Indonesian government followed up on the agreement by implementing a Popular Opinion (Pepera) from July 14 to August 2, 1969, represented by 1,025 people. The consideration for the selection of these representatives is because of the existing terrain conditions, the educational background of the people who are still primitive, the means of communication, and other matters that have been discussed in the preparatory meetings for Pepera implementation.

The Indonesian government's results of the Pepera implementation have been ratified and signed by the Indonesia and Netherland parties in UN General Assembly resolution No. 2504 (XXIV). The implementation of the Act of Free Choice is the implementation of the New York Agreement which requires an "Act of Free Choice" or interpreted as "self-determination" as referred to and explained in UN General Assembly resolutions No. 1514 and No. 1541 (XV). UN General Assembly Resolution 1514 contains the ideal principle of universal peace, while General Assembly Resolution 1541 (XV) affirms that after 1960 a non-self-governing territory (territory) can be declared eligible to become self-governing when: standing as an independent sovereign nation; free association with an independent state; or integration with an independent country.

According to this document, the principles of equal rights and people's self-determination written in the United Nations Charter include the right of all people to freely determine their destiny without external interference regarding their political, economic, social, and cultural status as well as the obligation of every state to respect this right. Following the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It is further added that the establishment of a sovereign and independent state, free association or integration with an independent state, or the emergence of other political statuses freely determined by the people and are ways to exercise the right to self-determination.

From the results of the implementation of the Pepera in 1969, it turned out that some Papuans were not entirely accepted, and it was this group that gave birth to the formation of the OPM, which since 1967 has carried out a series of activities against government policies. Along with that, various armed conflicts emerged between the OPM and the TNI and caused many fatalities on both sides. According to Nainggolan (2014: 182), the armed actions and international campaigns of the Papuan separatist movement are a reflection of the reality that there are still groups in Papuan society that have not and cannot accept the results of the 1969 Act of Free Choice, which are considered to have been engineered by the New Order government (Orba) for the political interests of its national integration.

To eliminate the desire of separatist groups in Papua, and to realize an increase in welfare for all Papuan people, the Indonesian government's development efforts in Papua after the implementation of the Act of Free Choice will continue to be implemented, one of the concrete forms carried out by the government is the transmigration program. President Soekarno started this program in 1964 under the name "Pioneer of Development for West Irian" (PPIB), this program was carried out not only to disperse the population living outside the territory of Papua, but it is also hoped that the process of acculturation and assimilation of the population will occur. The Indonesian government's results of the Pepera implementation have been ratified and signed by the Indonesian and Dutch parties in UN General Assembly resolution No. 2504 (XXIV). The implementation of the Act of Free Choice is the implementation of the New York Agreement which requires an "Act of Free Choice" or interpreted as "self-determination" as referred to and explained in UN General Assembly resolutions No. 1514 and No. 1541 (XV).

According to this document, the principles of equal rights and people's self-determination written in the United Nations Charter include the right of all people to freely determine their destiny without external interference regarding their political, economic, social, and cultural status as well as the



obligation of every state to respect this right. Following the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It is further added that the establishment of a sovereign and independent state, free association or integration with an independent state, or the emergence of other political statuses freely determined by the people and are ways to exercise the right to self-determination.

To eliminate the desire of separatist groups in Papua, and to realize an increase in welfare for all Papuan people, the Indonesian government's development efforts in Papua after the implementation of the Act of Free Choice will continue to be implemented, one of the concrete forms carried out by the government is the transmigration program. President Soekarno started this program in 1964 under the name "Pioneer of Development for West Irian" (PPIB), this program was carried out not only to disperse the population living outside the territory of Papua, but it is also hoped that the process of acculturation and assimilation of the population will occur.

The slow pace of development in Papua cannot be separated from issues related to customary rights. Academics from the State University of Papua Deda and Mofu (2014:12-13) said that customary rights are ownership rights that must be respected. Still, respect for traditional rights is sometimes mistranslated and has become one of the problems for the smooth development in West Papua. Based on the history of Indonesia, it has never been separated from the emergence of separatist movements in various regions, even from the results of research conducted by Sobandi (2011: 35), which states that Indonesia is one of the countries in Southeast Asia which is often faced with problems of separatist movements and has similarities in its handling with the governments of Thailand and the Philippines, namely using a military approach. According to Sobandi, the military approach taken by the governments of Thailand, the Philippines, and Indonesia is a countermeasure that is still considered adequate considering that separatist groups carry out armed violence against the public and the military.

The Indonesian government's policy of granting special autonomy to Papua has gone through various studies. These studies involved experts from multiple disciplines relevant to the problems in Papua but are also a political compromise. The preparation process is also very participatory and accommodating because it involves many stakeholders, including traditional leaders. Therefore, it can be said that this Special Autonomy is a form of asymmetrical political decentralization in mediating the separatist conflict in Papua. In addition, this Special Autonomy also protects fundamental rights based on customary laws so that the Papuan people can continue to develop all their capabilities. Substantially, it can be said that the granting of this special autonomy is expected to provide prosperity and maturity in various ways to the Papuan so that they can be aligned with people in other regions in Indonesia.

Referring to the description that has been submitted previously, there are still inconsistencies in understanding the conflicts that occur in Papua from various groups both at home and abroad, including positive efforts carried out by the Indonesian government, which seems meaningless. Therefore, serious efforts are needed to carry out social engineering in social arrangements, social resilience, and self-actualization of the Papuan people. Carrying out welfare development in Papua is expected to eliminate these issues.

3. Methods

This research was conducted using a quasi-qualitative method. Bungin (2007) defines the quasi-qualitative method as a quasi-qualitative research method because the quantitative research tradition still influences its form in terms of placing theory on the research data obtained. The quasi-qualitative method aims to summarize a situation or social phenomenon and focuses on the analysis of the data surface, namely a description of the processes and interactions that occur in a social phenomenon.

The quasi-qualitative method is considered suitable to be applied in this research because it allows researchers to focus on the process of collecting and analyzing data that is oriented towards



obtaining systemic understanding to answer complex research problems regarding social engineering in dealing with conflicts and issues of internationalization of Papua to support the integrity of Republic of Indonesia.

The application of the quasi-qualitative method in this study was carried out using an exploratory approach. The testing approach enables researchers to explore and understand the problems studied in depth to find various elements or variables contained in them (Bungin, 2007; Nugraheni, 2014). In this study, applying a quasi-qualitative method with an exploratory approach allows a thorough exploration of various complex phenomena and elements related to the conflict and issues of internationalization of Papua, then draws them to the surface to explain the processes and interactions as well as the details contained therein.

4. Result

The role of the Papuan community as an accelerator for the national settlement of Papuan separatism

The handling of separatism in Papua post-Pepera in 1969 has yet to be resolved entirely, either through a complex power approach in military operations or soft power in the form of methods and dialogues between the government and the leaders. The distortion of the separatist group towards the Orang Asli Papua/ native Papuan (OAP) in the form of threats of violence and the stigmatization of colonialism to the Indonesian government by separatist groups has divided OAP's view of the government's efforts to handle conflict in Papua. On the other hand, the stigmatization of Papua as a conflict area by some communities has become the antithesis of efforts to deal with Papuan separatism.

In addition, there are still actions that dichotomy of the role of OAP and placing them in the second class have given rise to views and assumptions that there has been the marginalization of the Papuan people in their work in this republic. This treatment resulted in OAP's distrust and antipathy towards the Indonesian government and people outside the OAP. This unfavorable condition becomes an obstacle in

involving the Papuan people scattered throughout Indonesia to become an accelerator of resolving the Papuan conflict. Suppose the community is to be used as an accelerator for the settlement of separatists. In that case, the government must first eliminate social inequality in Papua, including transparency in managing its natural resources.

Papuan people's perception of development programs in Papua to improve community welfare

Papua's abundant natural resources have indeed been the target of foreign parties since the Dutch colonial period. The limited educational background of most Papuans gave the Dutch an excellent opportunity to control and take over the management and utilization of natural resources. Citing an article from the State Intelligence Agency (BIN) entitled "Indonesia Looking at 2045" submitted by LIPI (2020), as follow;

"Many indigenous Papuan people (MAP) live in areas rich in natural resources, while the management of the customary regions is new in the form of a draft Special Regional Regulation (Perdapus), so it has not been realized. In everyday life, conflicts continue to occur between maintaining the Papuan locality aspect and the interests of development as well as investment or commercial business. This then raises the notion that Papua's wealth has become problematic because it is more like a resource curse than a blessing for Papuans.

Regarding the Papuan people's perception of development programs that the government has implemented to improve welfare, Wirayuda (2020) stated that the government has carried out development in various fields in Papua. Still, the people have not been able to experience the results of the development fully. It was also conveyed that there were four recipes for macronationalism in Papua, namely;

"First is the opinion of Papuan intellectuals that there is development, but outsiders are enjoying it. Second, there is an abuse of rights, values, traditions, and human rights by others. Third, the Papuan people have a powerful awareness that Papua is a rich land. Lastly, we want to host in our territory."



"We make Papua belong to Indonesia, but we don't make Indonesia belong to Papua."

From Gobai's point of view (2020), the involvement of the Papuan people in sustainable development is significant because there is a traumatic stigma among the Papuan people, especially during the implementation of military operations to crush separatist groups. Therefore, the government must be able to guarantee justice for Papuans as a whole; even Gobai conveyed several requirements to realize peace in Papua, namely: the conflict in Papua is also caused by historical distortions between Papuan people and the Indonesian government which should be resolved through a negotiation; it is necessary to correctly resolve human rights issues in Papua to stop violence cycle in Papua; if we talk about peace, there must be no sound of guns; there needs to be a ceasefire between the OPM and the TNI/Polri in Papua; stop buying and selling weapons and ammunition in Papua; and withdraw all Non-organic troops from Papua.

5. Discussion

According to Seldadyo (2020), the government's development is not only to improve welfare but also to be the involvement of the community's role in every development program in Papua. In addition, there is a need for equality leverage, which means that the Papuan people have equality with people in other regions in Indonesia, including efficiency leverage, which means that demographic and geographical factors must be a concern in supporting equality leverage itself. Seldadyo's statement is based on data and the fact that the HDI in Papua has indeed

increased but is still dominated by urban areas. In contrast, people living in remote areas, especially hills and mountains, still live in poverty, isolation, and limitations. Thus, the facts of development by the government in Papua still do not fulfill the sense of justice, equality, and effectiveness. Furthermore, the use of community lands has also not provided acceptable compensation and impacts increasing their welfare.

Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy is one form of central government policy to accommodate the aspirations of the Papuan people, especially in minimizing social inequality. The implementation of Special autonomy since 2002 as an effort to accelerate development and realize prosperity for the Papuan people is a long-standing hope for all Papuans. However, in reality, the implementation of special autonomy has not achieved the desired target, namely the creation of development progress and improvement of community welfare. Indeed, in this case, there are many influencing factors. Among these factors, the most significant is the security disturbances from separatist groups, which ultimately hinder the achievement of efforts to accelerate the welfare development of the Papuan people.

The commitment of the Indonesian government through the Special Autonomy Law and the Special Autonomy Fund is intended to build the welfare of the region and the Papuan people in four main sectors or areas of development consisting of education, health, people's economy, and infrastructure (LIPI, 2019). Table 1 provides a breakdown of the special autonomy funds that government has distributed since 2002.



Table 1. Special autonomy funding for Papua

No	Year	Special autonomy funding (IDR)	Infrastructure funding (IDR)	Total of special autonomy funding (IDR)
1	2002	1.382.300.000.000,00	0	1.382.300.000.000,00
2	2003	1.539.560.000.000,00	0	1.539.560.000.000,00
3	2004	1.642.617.943.000,00	0	1.642.617.943.000,00
4	2005	1.775.312.000.000,00	0	1.775.312.000.000,00
5	2006	2.913.284.000.000,00	536.374.689.000,00	3.449.658.689.000,00
6	2007	3.295.748.000.000,00	750.000.000.000,00	4.045.748.000.000,00
7	2008	3.590.142.897.000,00	330.000.000.000,00	3.920.142.897.000,00
8	2009	2.609.796.098.000,00	1.470.000.000.000,00	4.079.796.098.000,00
9	2010	2.694.864.788.000,00	800.000.000.000,00	3.494.864.788.000,00
10	2011	3.157.459.547.550,00	800.000.000.000,00	3.957.459.547.550,00
11	2012	3.833.402.135.000,00	571.428.571.000,00	4.404.830.706.000,00
12	2013	4.355.950.048.000,00	571.428.572.000,00	4.927.378.620.000,00
13	2014	4.777.070.975.000,00	2.000.000.000.000,00	6.777.070.975.000,00
14	2015	4.940.429.880.000,00	2.250.000.000.000,00	7.190.429.880.000,00
15	2016	5.395.051.859.400,00	1.200.000.000.000,00	6.595.051.859.400,00
16	2017	5.615.816.931.000,00	2.625.000.000.000,00	8.240.816.931.000,00
17	2018	5.580.152.407.000,00	2.400.000.000.000,00	7.980.152.407.000,00
18	2019	5.808.230.158.000,00	2.824.000.000.000,00	8.632.230.158.000,00
19	2020	5.861.910.600.000,00	2.853.973.800.000,00	8.715.884.400.000,00
	Total	70.769.100.266.950,00	21.982.205.632.000,00	92.751.305.898.950,00

Source: Papua Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency, 2019

In Papua development, President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono issued Presidential Instruction (Inpres) Number 5 of 2007 concerning the Acceleration of Development in Papua and West Papua. According to LIPI (2019) records, one of the policy packages in the Presidential Instruction is the Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate (MIFFE), which is designed to address the food and energy crisis while accelerating development in Papua. This proves that the central government sees that there are still inaccuracies in the distribution and use of Otsus funds, and even the design of the MIFFE program is expected to be one of the solutions.

Regarding the Special Autonomy program, Chandra (2020) said that the Central government should always coordinate with the Regional Government regarding the design and determination of regional development programs while still paying attention to the priority scale. No less important is implementing the supervisory function on the budget distribution so that no misuse results in diminishing public trust in the government.

Meanwhile, according to Gluba (2020), the facts on the ground show that the Papuan people, in general, have not enjoyed the Special Autonomy

funds, both in the form of physical and non-physical development or welfare improvements. There are still areas that are isolated from various aspects so that the impact on poverty, ignorance, backwardness, and social inequality has not been resolved.

In line with the opinion expressed by Gluba, the results of the LIPI research in 2019 found that the social issues that emerged in Papua were the distribution of access and opportunities in the fields of education and welfare. Quantitatively, the education and health sectors have increased, especially regarding schools, universities, health centers, hospitals, students, and medical personnel. However, the quality is still not growing. In other words, the principles of equality and equity, which refer to the standardization of welfare and the fulfillment of the community's basic needs, must be considered by the Indonesian government.

Building an integrated food estate to realize territorial resilience in Papua

It is necessary to carry out a reasonably in-depth analysis to assess the high social gap in Papua, especially since the enactment of Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua. The



budget allocation to support the implementation of Special Autonomy since 2002, which has almost reached 84 trillion rupiahs, is still not appropriately managed and requires a transparent and accountable control function from both the central and regional governments. This is why separatist groups build public opinion to some Papuans that the Indonesian government is deliberately widening the social gap.

In addition, the treatment of some Indonesians in an area towards MAP that still occurred around 2019 has created a perception that the government is still not serious in viewing the issue of discrimination and marginalization of MAP. Even the stigma of racial and tribal wars that occur in Papua has become material for exploiting the insecurity of the situation in the Papua region. The Indonesian government should pay attention to this fact to make repressive efforts to suppress public opinion.

Judging from the formulation of the government's Special Autonomy policy, it can be said that the policy has gone through a relatively long process. According to Menufandu (2020:5), there are 4 (four) main pillars of the Special Autonomy Law, namely: affirmative, protection, participation (participation), and empowerment (empowerment), all of which must be guided by the Central and Regional governments. To accelerate development in Papua, the government must remain guided by the Papuan community and territory entities that still adhere to the values of local wisdom, especially customs and culture.

In realizing sustainable welfare development in Papua, this study recommends the need for social engineering, a series of actions carried out systematically aimed at making social changes in people's lives. Rakhmat (2000:3) stated that social engineering is a planned social change (planned social change). Therefore, it is necessary to formulate programs that involve the community in deliberation and consensus. Even when these programs are determined to become a policy until their implementation, community involvement must still be prioritized.

Social engineering to realize the development of the welfare of the Papuan people is carried out

through a social arrangement which is defined as the arrangement of the social life of the community. Based on the opinion conveyed by Chumbow (2012: 457), the arrangement must pay attention to the principles, techniques, and methods related to natural science, technology, and social sciences. It is hoped that it can get the best solution to the problems that occur in the social sphere of society in its implementation. President Soekarno carried out the restructuring of the social life of the Papuan people by implementing a transmigration program aimed at helping and developing the capabilities of the Papuan people, especially in terms of farming. On the other hand, these programs are expected to support acculturation and assimilation programs, but these programs cause social conflicts between transmigrants and native Papuan.

Sustainable welfare development in Papua, which is still based on local wisdom, aside from prioritizing educative and persuasive principles, will indirectly form a social solid resilience condition for the community so that they can face any changes that disrupt the stability of the security of a group and the environment. as stated by Arnold and Cosmo (2015:12). According to Alshehri (2013:361), the heterogeneous condition of the Papuan people in the social and cultural context is a collaboration between social capital, economic capital, cultural capital, and symbolic capital, which are unique compared to people in other regions in Indonesia.

It is necessary to strengthen local institutions, including traditional institutions. This is because Papuan separatist groups are always trying to seek sympathy from the community to enhance the influence and goals of their movement. Strengthening the social condition of the Papuan people can also be done by transparently distributing the Otsus budget and the percentage of profit-sharing from natural resource processing used to improve the welfare of MAP. However, it is recognized that there are still obstacles in its distribution due to the distribution of community settlements challenging to reach.

With the formation of social solid resilience conditions, according to Mashlow (1943) and Danesh (2011), this condition can be interpreted that all



aspects of community need both individually and in groups have been met so that self-actualization (self-confidence) is strong and not easy. It is influenced to do things that are against the applicable laws and regulations. If these conditions have been formed, then according to Sadan (2004:144) the next process is to empower (empowerment) so that the social security situation that has been formed will be able to take root in the lives of the Papuan people. Community empowerment is also intended to shape the identity of native people so that discrimination, racism, or marginalization diminishes in the life of the nation and state.

Because of the natural and environmental conditions of the Papua region, according to Menufandu (2020:5), the people are divided into 3 (three) ecological zones, namely the coastal, coastal, and small islands ecological zones, lowlands and the foothills of mountains, mountains, and inland areas. The empowerment process must be carried out by taking into account these conditions. The situation of social resilience in a community environment cannot be separated from the logistical needs that are the primary consumption of the community. Therefore, this research discusses that the government should create an integrated food estate supporting the ongoing logistics supply chain.

What must be considered is that generalizing the logistics needs for the region and the Papuan people, which are divided into 7 (seven) customary areas cannot be done just like that, considering that the habits and needs of the community according to their ecological zones are different from each other. On this basis, the integrated food estate in Papua is carried out in stages according to the division of customary territories, which are geographically and demographically distinguished while continuing to carry out deliberation for consensus to implement all planned programs properly.

Given that the integrated food estate is integrated with the needs and security of a region, it is necessary to involve all officials, both the local government and the military, to realize territorial resilience. The importance of learning this is that disturbances in security and order from armed separatist groups were

still relatively high until this research was carried out. Collaboration between the community and law enforcement officers is directly a strengthening of Sishanta in Papua.

In addition, what is no less important is the involvement of all community components in Papua so that sustainable welfare development can be carried out correctly. Therefore, seriousness is needed in carrying out tasks according to the responsibilities carried out by the central government to the regions, especially in setting policies and deploying TNI forces to build the Universal People's Defense and Security System (Sishankamrata). In connection with this, the Ministry of Defense is the Leading Sector of all the activities mentioned above. This is because the need for the importance of realizing Sishankamrata throughout the Papua region is the responsibility of the Ministry of Defense in addition to strengthening resilience in each customary area.

6. Conclusion

The perception of the Papuan community towards the development program in Papua to improve the welfare of the community is still not entirely accepted by native Papuan because it has not yet touched them, and most of those who enjoy the results of development are migrants. The development carried out is still limited to urban areas, while most people living in the rural area and hinterland did not experience technological advances. The delay in development is more due to natural conditions and environmental factors that are still inaccessible. On the other hand, the limited infrastructure in transportation access that has not yet been developed also disrupts the affordability of development facilities and infrastructure in parts of Papua. The Indonesian government's efforts to eliminate the high social gap continue to be carried out by involving all ministries/agencies. In addition, the implementation of Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy as a policy to realize sustainable welfare development in Papua still needs to be evaluated.

The Papuan people's understanding of inter-tribal conflict is a social conflict that does not disturb peace



and security. The well-established inter-tribal ties based on the prevailing customary law make them realize that a prolonged conflict will lead to divisions between them. Persuasive efforts from local government officials and law enforcement officials to continue to unite the tribes in Papua continue to be carried out because they are one of the cultural treasures owned by this country to be maintained. Conflicts between ethnic groups have expanded to become conflicts between native Papuan and migrants because of differences in welfare levels.

7. References

- Alshehri SA, Rezgui Y, Li H. Public perception of the risk of disasters in a developing economy: the case of Saudi Arabia. *Nat Hazards*, 2013,65: 1813-30.
- Arnold M, de Cosmo S. Building social resilience protecting and empowering those most at risk. 2015, Washington: The World Bank.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Papua. Provinsi Papua dalam angka. 2020, Jayapura: CV. Karya Kelabat.
- Bungin B. Penelitian kualitatif: Komunikasi, ekonomi, kebijakan publik, dan ilmu sosial lainnya. 2nd ed. 2007. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Chumbow SB. Social engineering theory: A model for the appropriation of innovations with a case study of the health MDGs. *Social sciences and cultural studies – issues of language, public opinion, education and welfare*. 2012. Cameroon: University of Yaounde 1 and Cameroon Academy of Sciences.
- Deda AJ, Mofu SS. Masyarakat hukum adat dan hak ulayat di provinsi Papua Barat sebagai orang asli Papua ditinjau dari sisi adat dan budaya: Sebuah kajian etnografi kekinian. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik Universitas Negeri Papua*, 2014, 11(2): 90-6.
- Elisabeth A. Dimensi Internasional Kasus Papua. 2006, Jakarta: LIPI.
- Maslow AH. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 1943, 50 (4): 370-96.
- Menufandu M. Masalah lama dengan kemungkinan baru: Suatu analisis politik. 1999. \Nainggolan PP. Aktivitas internasional gerakan separatis Papua. *Jurnal Kajian*, 2014, 19 (3): 10-5.
- Nugrahani F. Metode penelitian kualitatif. 2014. Solo: Cakra Books.
- Sobandi KR. Separatisme di Asia Tenggara: Antara penguasa dan gerakan nasionalis kelompok minoritas. *Jurnal Kajian Wilayah*, 2011, 2 (1): 88-95.
- Wirajuda NH. Penyelesaian masalah Papua dalam perspektif dalam dan luar negeri. 2020. presented in FGD-2 in Universitas Pertahanan, Bogor, Indonesia on August 26, 2020.

