



## **Socio-cultural analysis of the independent Papua Organization (OPM) and the narrative of Papua integration into Indonesia**

**\*Enty Forisna Lastaruli Manalu**

Department of History Education, Universitas Negeri Medan  
Email: entymanalu24@gmail.com

**Efyka Tamala Sitorus Pane**

Department of History Education, Universitas Negeri Medan  
Email: efykatamala23@gmail.com

**Joshua Kalebso Manalu**

Department of History Education, Universitas Negeri Medan  
Email: josuamanaludg25@gmail.com

**Neliana Lubis**

Department of History Education, Universitas Negeri Medan  
Email: nelianalubisnelly@gmail.com

\*Correspondence

**Article History:** Received: 30-07-2022, Revised: 19-10-2022 Accepted: 19-10-2022, Published: 29-12-2022

### **Abstract**

This study aims to analyse the socio-cultural organisation of the Free Papua Movement (OPM) and the narrative of the integration of Papua into Indonesia. The diversity of styles or points of view of historical writing regarding the integration of Papua into Indonesia cannot be separated from the sociology and culture of the historical writers, whether they support Indonesia, support Papua, or write based on historical facts. This study uses historical research methods consisting of heuristics, source verification or criticism, interpretation, and historiography. The study results show that integrating Papua into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) has two different narratives. First, the version of the government of the Republic of Indonesia says that the process of integrating Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is legal and by the constitution. Second, the Free Papua Organization (OPM) version states that this is illegal and violates human rights. These two narratives are currently developing in history learning, with different intensities. Until now, Papua remains part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

### **Keywords:**

historiography; integration; nationalism; socio-cultural analysis

### **Abstrak**

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis social-kultural Organisasi Papua Merdeka (OPM) dan narasi integrasi Papua ke Indonesia. Keberagaman gaya atau sudut pandang penulisan sejarah tentang integrasi Papua ke Indonesia tidak lepas dari sosiologi dan kultural para penulis sejarah, baik yang mendukung Indonesia, mendukung Papua, maupun menulis berdasarkan fakta sejarah. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian

sejarah, yang terdiri dari heuristik, verifikasi atau kritik sumber, interpretasi, dan historiografi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa proses integrasi Papua ke dalam Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia (NKRI) memiliki dua narasi yang berbeda. Pertama, versi pemerintah Republik Indonesia mengatakan bahwa proses integrasi Papua ke dalam wilayah NKRI adalah sah dan sesuai dengan konstitusi. Kedua, versi Organisasi Papua Merdeka (OPM) menyatakan bahwa ini ilegal dan melanggar hak asasi manusia. Kedua narasi tersebut saat ini berkembang dalam pembelajaran sejarah, tentunya dengan intensitas yang berbeda. Pada akhirnya, sampai saat ini Papua tetap menjadi bagian dari Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia.

#### Kata Kunci:

analisis sosial-kultural; historiografi; integrasi; nasionalisme



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

#### Introduction

Integrating Papua into *Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia* (NKRI, The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia) has two different narratives. First, the government's version says that the process of integrating Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is legal and by the constitution. Second, *Organisasi Papua Merdeka* (OPM, Free Papua Organization) version states that this is illegal and violates human rights. These two narratives are currently developing in history learning, with different intensities. National figures and more mention that the process of integration of Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is legal and by the constitution (Suter, 2001). While the book is aimed at critical history learning, there is mention of the process of integration of Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia as illegal, manipulative and violating human rights.

Among them is a book entitled *Apakah Indonesia Menduduki dan Menjajah Bangsa Papua. Tantangan dan Harapan Masa Depan Bangsa Papua dalam Pemaksaan Nasionalisme Keindonesian dan Imprealisme Kapitalis di Papua* (Is Indonesia Occupying and Colonizing the Papuan Nation? Challenges and Future Hopes of the Papuan Nation in Forcing Indonesian Nationalism and Capitalist Imprealism in Papua) by Socratez Sofyan Yoman (Yoman, 2013). Of course, studying why the narrative can be different from the same event is interesting. For this reason, the socio-culture of the Free Papua Organization (OPM) can be reviewed in the report on integrating Papua into Indonesia in history learning based on Kuntowijoyo's thoughts.

In the context of social movements in Tanah Papua, most Papuan intellectuals' writing of history from below, related to experiences and claims against "official history" (read: state construction), should be appreciated. The history of annexation and integration claims will not be found in the Indonesian National History Lesson (Aspinall & Berger, 2001; Fikri & Hasudungan, 2021). Likewise, the history of violence and human rights violations is unlikely to find its place. What may emerge is a "tribal" and "primitive" image of the Papuan people with the *koteka* icon, considered inferior to Indonesian culture, which is said to be noble. This picture is usually depicted in the ethnography of isolated tribes or tribal

studies in universities and schools, which are biased, misleading, and very colonial perspectives. Indonesia's claim to Papua is based on the legitimacy of the UN law, which ratified the 1969 *Penentuan Pendapat Rakyat (Pepera)*, Act of free choice) and declared Papua to join Indonesia. However, the experience of the Papuan people and some research claims mention that the implementation of the 1969 Pepera was full of manipulation and intimidation or just a joke (Scott & Tebay, 2005). Papua's integration into Indonesia is limited to regional, political, economic and security integration (Druce, 2020).

The diversity of styles or points of view of writers and observers of OPM cannot be separated from human creativity throughout history due to human activities creating meaning that refers to reality and everyday experience (Kuntowijoyo, 2006). What this means thoughts of the writers emerge cannot be separated from the basic sociology introductory knowledge that underlies them. For this reason, this paper aims to look at the various perspectives of writers, observers, scientists and practitioners who have produced works on the Free Papua Organization. Based on the explanation above, the author takes the title "Socio-Cultural Analysis of the Free Papuan Organization (OPM) and the Narrative of the Integration of Papua into Indonesia".

## Methods

This research uses the historical method; writing history is a method that must be done in writing history. The author must use the historical writing method so that there is no disconnect between historical events and ensure that the history written has relevance (influence) to this day (Zuhdi, 2018). Here are the four most frequently used stages of history writing. The first is heuristics, a process of gathering information or gathering sources for historical research. Based on the basis historical sources are divided into primary sources and secondary sources. Primary sources are collecting information directly without intermediaries, such as interviews with eyewitnesses of historical events, inscriptions, ancient manuscripts and others. In contrast, secondary sources collect information indirectly through newspapers, books, journals or magazines (McCullagh, 2000).

Primary historical sources are collections of photographs such as the Act of free choice and the Trikora Military Operation in Papua in December 1961. Act of accessible choice archives, as well as recordings and archives of President Soekarno's order "*TriKora, Tri Komando Rakyat*". Meanwhile, secondary sources were taken from journal articles in the Google Scholar database, DOAJ, Sinta and others. Coupled books and internet websites are also secondary data in this research.

The second is verification or source criticism. After the collection of historical sources is complete, the historical sources will enter the verification or source criticism stage. The historical sources that have been collected will be tested in terms of their authenticity and credibility. There are two kinds of criticism made. The first is external criticism, namely criticism of the authenticity of the source covering aspects of the source material, authenticity verification, and time or date. Then the second is internal criticism, namely criticism of credibility by testing the source either in material, written or oral, for example, by cross-checking one informant with another.

The third is Interpretation. The stages are carried out to analyse and compare the other facts with other facts so that the existing points are coherent. Fourth is historiography—the process of writing history based on sources that have been found, assessed, selected and criticised. In writing history, writers must pay attention to writing rules such as punctuation, discussion and writing format, and use of terms and references to historical sources.

## Result and Discussion

### The Historiographical Pattern of the Free Papua Organization

Efforts to study, let alone compare, two historical works are not an easy matter. Moreover, if the writings that will be reviewed and compared are still "less familiar" with the repertoire of our knowledge. If we examine someone's thoughts and work in any field of science, especially in the social and human sciences, it is always associated with some basic questions. According to Juwono Sudarsono (in Wirajuda, 2014), the questions involve at least three things. *First*, who is the person and what is their social background? The answer to that question is essential because it will affect the colour and style of writing, vision and methodology used in studying the issues of interest.

*Second*, in the era of how writing was done. Because usually, the signs, enthusiasm, and needs of the times have more or less influence on the content and mission of the report to be conveyed, either implicitly or explicitly. And third, the question relates to whether the results of the thought and study in the present context are still relevant. That means whether the scientific reconstruction they provide to the existing socio-historical reality already includes and is appropriate to the current needs. Thus, we will look at some notes, criticisms and comments against them, both regarding the approach and methods used, as well as the results of thoughts, descriptions and interpretations in writing.

The basic methodology consists of three main components: cultural institutions, cultural content, and cultural effects or norms. Kuntowijoyo mapped the framework into several historical categories, including the variety of traditional-patrimonial history, the type of capitalist history, and the sort of technocratic history. These are not always alternating sequences, but they can overlap, although there is a chronological order (Kuntowijoyo, 2006).

The methodology of socio-historical analysis was introduced by the historian Kuntowijoyo. This approach examines a symbolic process (superstructure), in this case, historical works, by analysing the historical categories, the extended universe in them, and the basic structures that influence them. First, knowing the key terms used in Kuntowijoyo's socio-historical methodology is necessary. The first is the basic understanding of the structure. This study not only refers to social and economic conditions but also includes the other side, namely norms, modes of social organisation and social resources. The second is a symbolic process, namely human activities constructing meaning for other realities from daily experience.

Integrating Papua into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) has two different narratives. First, the government's version says that integrating Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is legal and by the constitution (Noor, 2018). Second, the Free Papua Organization (OPM) version states that this is illegal and violates human rights (Pigai, 2014; tempo.co, 2019). These two

narratives are currently developing in history learning, with different intensities and interests.

National figures and more mention that the process of integration of Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is legal and by the constitution. Meanwhile, in the book devoted to critical history learning, it is mentioned that the integration of Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is illegal, manipulative and violates human rights. One of them is the book *Apakah Indonesia Menduduki dan Menjajah Bangsa Papua. Tantangan dan Harapan Masa Depan Bangsa Papua dalam Pemaksaan Nasionalisme Keindonesian dan Imprealisme Kapitalis di Papua* (Is Indonesia Occupying and Colonizing the Papuan Nation? Challenges and Future Hopes of the Papuan Nation in Forcing Indonesian Nationalism and Capitalist Imprealism in Papua) by Socrates Sofyan Yoman.



**Figure 1.** Act of free choice (*Penentuan Pendapat Rakyat, Pepera*) in 1969 (Permana, 2016)

Socrates Sofyan Yoman is a priest, activist, and fighter for the Papuan Separatist Movement in politics (GSP/P). He is actively fighting for Papuan independence. On November 8, 2004, commemorating the University of Cendrawasih, Jayapura, he presented a paper entitled; *Pepera 1969 di Papua Barat Tidak Demokratis* (Pepera 1969 in West Papua is not democratic). He, along with Tom Beanal, Thaha Alhamid, Willy Mandowen, and Terrianus Yoku, have also been to the United States to lobby the US Congress and the United Nations so that the history of Papua is straightened out and a referendum is held to determine self-determination for the Papuan people.

The book *Tindakan Pilihan Bebas: Orang Papua dan Penentuan Nasib Sendiri* (Action Free Choice: Papuans and Self-Determination), written by Drooglever at the request of the Dutch Parliament in 1999, to form the basis for a new dialogue with Indonesia on the future of Papua following reforms in Indonesia a year earlier (Drooglever, 2010). Because institutions in the Netherlands sponsored it, this book became controversial in Indonesia. However, as noted in the Preface, this book is not a government document but an “objective” academic study. Drooglever emphasises the fate of the Papua people and does not represent the interests of big countries, including the Netherlands. The author dug up archives in the

Netherlands, the US, the United Nations, and Australia and interviewed several Papuans, including former officials and clergy.

Unfortunately, Indonesia's official archives regarding Papua are still closed. The fate of the Papuan people is indeed tragic, and Drooglever is trying to explore how this tragedy happened. He told a story that began with the high expectations of the Papuan people in the early 1950s and ended in atrocities at the hands of the Indonesian military in 1962. Meanwhile, the international community was mostly idly by. This is a story of truth having to grapple with falsehood. The story is quite convincing because crime has continued to proliferate for decades throughout Indonesia. Not only in Papua but crimes are repeated every time the New Order regime violates the human rights of its citizens. However, the “truth against falsehood” story is not a true tragedy. It is more of a heroic tale.

Unlike Timor Leste before the 1999 referendum, Papua did not have the status of a colony that had not yet experienced decolonisation (Clark, 1980; Strating, 2014). The United Nations has accepted the Act of Free Choice as an exercise of self-determination. However, to this day, the most potent argument for Papuan resistance is to rely on their ethnic uniqueness. Drooglever seems to follow such a storyline. Luckily, this highly detailed book can be read in other ways.

Benny Giay (in Yoman, 2013) makes a powerful statement. After “annexing” West Papua, the Indonesian government introduced Indonesian history and led Papua to accept Indonesian history as its history. The process of forcing history is absolute because it is part of the spirit of the Indonesianization of the Papua people. The history of the Papua people is “lost” in various ways. If the people of Papua talk about their history, they are considered separatist and dangerous and should be wary of it. The cleansing, erasure, and marginalisation of the history of the Papuan people are carried out to build the construction that the Papuan Nation has no history, and Indonesia is the one who came as a messianic one who brought an item called "history" for the Papuan Nation (Mukhtadi, 2021).

### **A Brief History of *Organisasi Papua Merdeka (OPM, Free Papua Organization)***

The Papuan people's movement for self-determination has occurred since the Japanese occupation of Papua in 1942-1946 (Parera et al., 2013; Kompas, 2022). Many historical manuscripts of the resistance of the Papuan people cited the Korero movement in the Biak area as the most spectacular Papuan resistance movement at that time. The Korero movement was led by Angganitha Menafaur. She dubbed herself the 'Golden Queen of Judea' and ordained herself as the incarnate female prophet of Manseren Manggoendi. The Korero movement then transformed a *kebatinan* movement into an ethnic-nationalist-political independence movement due to the militancy of Stephanus Simopyaref, Menafaur's comrade in arms. Simopyaref is ambitious to unite all Melanesian tribes and clans into a single view of Papuan nationalism.

In 1942, the Japanese killed about 500–600 followers of the Korero resistance movement. Menafaur was detained by the Japanese army and then taken to Manokwari (Kompas, 2022b). As a first step in promoting the ideals of Papuan independence, Simopyaref initiated the mission to save Menafaur. He instructed the assembly of the army, fleet and people, using the inverted Dutch flag plus the white starfish (*sampari*) on a blue background. This flag is named after the Korero

flag. Simopyaref claimed that Manseren Mangundi had revealed the flag to Menafaur.

In mid-1942, Simopyaref was captured by the Japanese army after a series of dialogues and gun battles had taken place between Simopyaref's camp and the Japanese military. He was then taken to Manokwari. Together with Menafaur, they were both threatened with death by the Japanese government. However, Simopyaref's passion for the independence of the Papuan nation was echoed in the Koreri Menafaur movement. The adventure of the Papuan nation in self-determination entered a brand new segment all through the practice for the independence of the Republic of Indonesia.

In the BPUPKI session on July 10 and 11, 1945, the knowledge of the popularity of Papua as a part of the territory of Indonesia became a subject of fierce debate among the leaders of the conflict for Indonesian independence. In the view of Moh. Yamin, Soekarno and Kahar Muzakar, Indonesia's geopolitical method calls for Papua to be included with Indonesia, even though ethnographically, Papuans are different from the Indonesian people (Webster, 2013). Even Soekarno stated, if judging from the historical side, in *Nagarakertagama* (a chronicle manuscript of the Majapahit era written by Mpu Prapanca), Papua turned out to be included in the territory of the Majapahit kingdom (Hairiyadi & Akmal, 2020). After all, Sukarno and Muzakar were already in awe of Papua's natural wealth, which they thought was priceless.

However, M. Hatta is different. According to him, the views of Yamin, Soekarno and their friends are imperialist. By viewing the anthropology approach, the Papuans are Melanesians, not Polynesians, who inhabit most of the Republic of Indonesia. The question of whether or not Papua is enclosed within the territory of Indonesia or not, in keeping with Hatta, is left to the Papuan people's decision (Effendi & Panjaitan, 2021).

On December 27, 1949, the Netherlands recognised Indonesian sovereignty, but Papua was administratively still under the auspices of the Dutch kingdom (Chauvel, 2005; King, 2019). Feeling that they have been dredging up the natural wealth of Papua for too long, the Dutch felt the need to give freedom to the Papuan people to determine their destiny. The moral mission of the Dutch government's decolonisation was to prepare for the independence of Papua as an independent state under the auspices of the Dutch. Responding to the Dutch intention, the educated Papuan elite planned for self-determination by forming the Nieuw Guinea Raad, which was inaugurated in April 1951.

To realise the Dutch decolonisation mission, several leaders of the Nieuw Guinea Raad, namely Nicolaas Jouwe and his friends, formed a national committee to prepare the tools and symbols of state equipment. The prepared Papuan nation-state was named West Papua (West Papua). On December 1, 1961, the Morning Star, the national flag of West Papua, was hoisted parallel to the Dutch flag, and the national anthem, "Hai Tanahku Papua", was sung in front of the Dutch royal crown (Glazebrook, 2008; Saravanamuttu, 2009).

The incident spread quickly to the centre of the Indonesian government. From the Yogyakarta square, through the *Tri Komando Rakyat* (People's Tri Command) speech on December 19, 1961, President Soekarno ignited the spirit of returning West Irian to the motherland from the scenario of the formation of a Dutch puppet state (Meteray, 2020). In early 1962, Indonesian troops began launching operations

to liberate West Irian (Mulyadi et al., 2021). Amid the heating up of the Dutch-Indonesian conflict, in March 1962, the United States submitted a proposal to the United Nations regarding the resolution of the West Papua issue. The recommendation was followed by the New York Agreement on August 15, 1962 (van der Veur, 1964; Lumintang, 2009; Zahidi & Pradana, 2020).



**Figure 2.** *Trikora* Military Operation in Papua in December 1961 (Airspace Review, 2018)

The agreement between the Dutch government and the Indonesian government contains: (1) The Netherlands handed over administrative responsibility for the administration of West Papua to the United Nations through the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA); (2) Effective May 1, 1962, UNTEA handed over West Irian to Indonesia; (3) At the end of 1969, under the supervision of the United Nations, an Act of Free Choice was carried out for the Papuan people to be able to determine their destiny or independence (Fiona & Kusniati, 2021). "The Act of self-determination will be completed before the end of 1969," said Article XX of the New York Agreement. From July 14 to August 2, 1969, the Act of Free Choice for the people of West Papua was held through *Pepera* (Act of free choice).

However, *Pepera* (Act of free choice) is only represented by 1,025 Papuans, while the Act of self-determination requires one person, one vote (One Man, One Vote) (Taum, 2015). For the people of Papua, until now, *Pepera* (an Act of free choice) is still considered a form of manipulation by Indonesia to control the land of Papua. On the other hand, Indonesia argues that the one-man, one-vote system is incompatible with Indonesian culture, which adheres to the principle of deliberation to reach a consensus based on Pancasila.

The Free Papua Organization (OPM) is dissatisfied with the Indonesian government's policies as long as Papua is integrated with Indonesia. The OPM struggle is to escape from the Unitary State of Indonesia (NKRI) (Martianto & Isnaini, 2021). The development of the OPM movement and work took place in various places in Papua, and lasted from 1967 to 2001. Leirissa et al. (1992), in the book "History of the Integration Process of Irian Jaya" published in 1992, assessed that the OPM's separatist movement and a series of related events that occurred in Papua was the result of the Dutch upbringing, which at any time would explode.



With this perspective, Leirissa seems to blame foreigners for the failure of the Indonesian government to manage the Papua conflict as long as Papua is integrated with Indonesia. The separatist movement that occurs in Papua is interesting to observe for several reasons, including: (1) Papua is presently the sole province in Indonesia whose integration method is thru a world mechanism with the determination of the popular opinion (Pepera/Act of free choice); (2) The separatist movement in Papua shows the combined character of the traditional understanding of the tribes with the image of worship of the Koreri or the Morning Star on the one hand, and on the opposite hand diode by those that are educated in ideology fashionable nationality to hold out dignified political lobbying (Ningsih et al., 2022); (3) This separatist movement in Papua lasts an extended time and is often ready to renew its leadership.

After the 1969 Act of Free Choice, Indonesianization took place in Papua. Various development programs were introduced by marginalising the experiences and socio-cultural values of the Papuan people. The centralised and top-down system caused Papua only to become the object of development; the same thing happened in every region in Indonesia during the authoritarian New Order regime in power. Layered discrimination also occurs because Papua is not only geographically distant, the easternmost region in Indonesia, but also culturally "distant". This short article discusses two critical points. First, the debate on perspectives in the Papuan nation's "nationalist" social movement, and second, the subaltern historiography movement through books published by Papuan intellectuals. The proliferation of these publications has become a kind of perspective on people's experiences within the broad framework of the Papuan social movement to write their nation's history.

The complexity of the debate over the political status of Papua's integration into the Indonesian state has been a constant debate. The Papuan people think that the integration process and the 1969 Act of Free Choice are examples of how Indonesia's historical "manipulation" took over the land of Papua—pumping and imposing Indonesian nationalism and extinguishing local history in Papua, which is full of dynamics and heterogeneity. Indonesia imposes nationalism which states that Papua is part of the territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) with various efforts, from manipulation to continuous intimidation until now.

This resistance to "*baku tipu*" (deceit) was then voiced by the Papuan people through various forms of expression of demonstrations, protests, and writing a history of the experiences and violence they experienced by the state (read: the Indonesian government). The history of the knowledge of the Papua people is permanently attached to a mighty word: separatism. All Papua identity expressions are always scapegoated into extremist, pro-independence movements and are associated with the OPM (Free Papua Organization). Whereas behind the historiography of the scapegoat against Papua, we should look at the long history of Papua being a part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. It is full of upheaval between the Netherlands and Indonesia.

Papuan nationalism and historiography were ultimately a tension between Indonesia and the Netherlands that did not involve the Papua people at all. The writing of Papua historiography is also dominated by Indonesian nationalists who get rid of Papuan nationalism, a political identity shaped by the Dutch colonial

experience and its interest in maintaining its power. This Papua identity in the colonial experience was constructed as the antithesis of Indonesian nationalism by the Papuan people. The Indonesian nationalism applied in Papua is militaristic. This is manifested through *Daerah Operasi Militer* (DOM, Military Operations Area) as well as a long series of violence and barbarity that befell the Papuan people as a form of dehumanisation, not considering the Papuan people as human beings.

Indonesian nationalism declares a fixed price for the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. However, behind the "politics of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia" and nationalism, there is a breath of militarism which then responds to the protests of the Papuan people against state policies that marginalise them, which makes the *kitorang tra maju-maju* (we Papua people do not move forward) with a security and violence approach. Several cases of torture by the authorities against the Papua people are clear examples and are witnessed by the public. The military often claims political violence with a security approach as a noble effort to maintain the integrity of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia against separatist groups who want to leave the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Papua historiography, in the end, became the legitimacy of the Indonesian state, plus a heroic and patriotic narrative from the military.

### **Integration of Papua into Indonesia**

West Irian, or Papua, is an Indonesian province located at the western tip of Indonesia. The establishment of Papua began with the Round Table Conference (KMB), which was held on December 27, 1949. Through the KMB, the Netherlands was willing to give its sovereignty to Indonesia. However, Indonesia and the Netherlands are still in conflict. These two countries still feel entitled to the land of Papua or West Irian (Fikri & Hasudungan, 2022). Because the Dutch still wanted the western part of Papua to be formed as their own country, they finally brought this issue to the United Nations (UN) forum.

In the end, the Dutch were willing to discuss again with Indonesia, which later formed the New York agreement. Through this agreement, the Netherlands is ready to hand over its control over Papua or West Irian to the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA). The Pepera results show that western Papua chose to remain part of Indonesia. Furthermore, based on Law no. 5 of 1974 concerning the Principles of Governance, by the Central Government, the Irian Jaya region is aligned with other areas of Indonesia.

In 1999, Law No. 45 of 1999 was issued concerning the Establishment of West Irian Jaya and Central Irian Jaya. However, this later sparked controversy because it was felt to overlap with Law No. 1 of 2001 on Special Autonomy. According to the law, the two new provinces were inaugurated on October 12, 1999. However, the formation of the new provinces was not immediately realised and was delayed. Then in 2003, the area's shape's echo began to be heard again. After waiting for three years, three months and 13 days, Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 2003 were issued, to be precise on February 6, 2003, regarding the re-activation of West Irian Jaya Province, whose government was assisted by the Facilitation Team of the Manokwari Regency Government and the Central Assistance Team which was chaired directly by Minister of Home Affairs.

Executive Director of the Institute for Research, Assessment and Development of Legal Aid or LP3BH Manokwari, Jan Christian Warinussy, stated

that up to 52 years after the People's Opinion Determination or Pepera was held in Jayapura on August 2, 1969, Papua's still rejected the results of the Act. Wariness stated that the 1969 Act of Free Choice was left because its implementation was undemocratic. The performance of (*Pepera*) began on July 14, 1969, from Merauke, Wamena, Nabire, Fakfak, Sorong, Manokwari, and Biak, until it ended in Kota Baru (Sukarnapura). As a result, 1,025 people selected from around 800,000 Papuan people expressed their determination to join Indonesia. He said the results of the Pepera were often questioned or contested by the Papuan people, arguing that the implementation of the Pepera was not democratic. In addition, the presence of the Indonesian state apparatus has been followed by much unfair treatment of Papuan civilians. Some Papua civilians have been tortured to death, executed in a flash, disappeared, or forcibly disappeared.

### Conclusion

The integration of West Papua into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia is carried out through an unfair and unfair process. The Papua issue is a historical problem of incorrect integration. The point of the political status of the Papua people who are betrayed, ignored and eliminated. The problem of human rights violations is still ongoing. The issue the failure of development in Tanah Papua is because growth in Tanah Papua is carried out with suspicion and an excessive security approach. The image of an independent West Papuan state has been difficult to extinguish. Several historical records corroborate the shadow of having this own country. On 5 April 1961, with the assistance of the Dutch Government, a people's council, the Nieuw Guinea Raad, was formed by electing Papuans to sit in parliament to design and implement an independent state. On October 19, 1961, the Papuan People's Council held the First Papuan National Congress in Hollandia (now Jayapura) with the result that the national anthem was "*Hai Tanahku Papua*", the national flag was "*Bintang Kejora*", and the official name of the country was "West Papua". Moreover, Papua "nationalism" is constructed by several factors, namely: *First*, historical disappointment with the integration process into Indonesia. *Second*, the Papuan elite who feel competition with Indonesian officials since Dutch colonialism. *Third*, unequal economic development and governance increasingly show a sense of difference. *Fourth*, a large number of migrants to Papua who dominate economic and political life, which further increases the feeling of being marginalized by Papua's in their area. Other complementary perspectives reveal that the "ethnic nationalism" of the Papuan nation was born apart from an awareness of Papuan ethnicity, as well as resistance to the authoritarian New Order regime and the game of international power relations against Papua. Under the New Order, for the first time in history, Papua experienced colonialism that absorbed natural resources into other areas and introduced the massacre of humans by state officials. In this regard, there is an international game against Papua. The latter refers to the role of the Netherlands, Indonesia, the United Nations and the United States, which eventually gave birth to the compromise of the 1962 New York Agreement and the 1969 *Pepera* (Act of free choice).

### References

Airspace Review. (2018, December 7). Trikora, Operasi Militer Penuh Pengorbanan demi Merebut Papua dari Tangan Belanda. *Www.Airspace-*

- Review.Com.* <https://www.airspace-review.com/2018/12/07/trikora-operasi-militer-penuh-pengorbanan-demi-merebut-papua-dari-tangan-belanda/>.
- Aspinall, E., & Berger, M. T. (2001). The Break-up of Indonesia? Nationalisms after Decolonisation and the Limits of the Nation-State in Post-Cold War Southeast Asia. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(6), 1003–1024. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3993459>.
- Chauvel, R. (2005). *Policy Studies 14: Constructing Papuan nationalism: History, Ethnicity, and Adaptation*. <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/26108/PS014.pdf>.
- Clark, R. (1980). The “Decolonization” of East Timor and the United Nations Norms on Self-Determination and Aggression Roger. *Yale J. World Pub. Ord.*, 1, 1–44. [http://heinonlinebackup.com/hol-cgi-bin/get\\_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/yjil7&section=8](http://heinonlinebackup.com/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/yjil7&section=8).
- Drooglever. (2010). *Tindakan Pilihan Bebas! Orang Papua Dan Penentuan Nasib Sendiri* (1st ed.). Kanisius.
- Druce, S. C. (2020). Political Impasse vs Economic Development: A History and Analysis of the West Papua Conflict in Indonesia. In *Managing Conflicts in a Globalizing ASEAN* (pp. 89–116). Springer Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9570-4\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9570-4_5).
- Effendi, T., & Panjaitan, A. C. D. (2021). Konsekuensi Penetapan Status Kelompok Kriminal Bersenjata (KKB) Dalam Konflik Papua Sebagai Gerakan Teroris Menurut Hukum Pidana. *Rechtidee*, 16(2), 223–245. <https://doi.org/10.21107/ri.v16i2.11823>.
- Fikri, A., & Hasudungan, A. N. (2021). Analisis Kompetensi Dasar Esensial pada Mata Pelajaran Sejarah Indonesia di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Indonesian Journal of Social Science Education (IJSSE)*, 3(1), 20–31. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.29300/ijssse.v3i1.4008>.
- Fikri, A., & Hasudungan, A. N. (2022). The Nasionalisasi-Investasi Perusahaan Asing, Mafia Berkeley dan Berakhirnya Rezim Presiden Soekarno. *Yupa: Historical Studies Journal*, 5(2), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.30872/yupa.v5i2.784>
- Fiona, S. B., & Kusniati, R. (2021). Status Hukum Papua Barat: The Right to Self-Determination atau National Integrity? *Uti Possidetis: Journal of International Law*, 1(1), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.22437/up.v1i1.8433>.
- Glazebrook, D. (2008). Speaking historically about West Papua. In *Permissive Residents* (pp. 13–30). ANU Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt24hbpg.7>.
- Hairiyadi, & Akmal, H. (Eds.). (2020). *Lintasan Sejarah Maritim Kalimantan Selatan (Awal Mula dan Perkembangannya sampai Masa Kerajaan)* (Banjarmasi). Program Studi Pendidikan Sejarah Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Lambung Mangkurat Banjarmasin. [https://repositori.ulm.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/19009/Lintasan Sejarah Maritim Kalimantan Selatan.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://repositori.ulm.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/19009/Lintasan%20Sejarah%20Maritim%20Kalimantan%20Selatan.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y).
- King, J. M. K. (2019). A soul divided: The UN’s misconduct over West Papua. *Portal (Australia)*, 16(1–2), 59–81.

<https://doi.org/10.5130/portalsv16i1/2.6532>.

- Kompas. (2022a, February 3). Perlawanan Rakyat Papua terhadap Kekejaman Jepang. *Kompas.Com*.  
<https://www.kompas.com/stori/read/2022/02/03/120000879/perlawanan-rakyat-papua-terhadap-kekejaman-jepang?page=all#:~:text=Gerakan Koreri adalah gerakan yang,Namun%2C mereka tidak menyerah>.
- Kompas. (2022b, March 8). L Rumkorem, Pemimpin Perlawanan terhadap Jepang di Biak. *Kompas.Com*.  
<https://www.kompas.com/stori/read/2022/03/08/080000179/1-rumkorem-pemimpin-perlawanan-terhadap-jepang-di-biak?page=all>.
- Kuntowijoyo. (2006). *Budaya dan Masyarakat*. Tiara Wacana.
- Leirissa, R. ., Haryono, P. S., Ohorella, G. A., & Wasith, M. (1992). *Sejarah proses integrasi Irian Jaya*. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan Direktorat Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional Proyek Inventarisasi dan Dokumentasi Sejarah Nasional.
- Lumintang, O. M. (2009). the Resistance of People in Papua (1945-1962). *Historia: Jurnal Pendidik Dan Peneliti Sejarah*, *X*(2), 47–60.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17509/historia.v10i2.12221>.
- Martianto, R. W. U., & Isnaini, M. (2021). Kontra Propaganda Deklarasi Negara Papua Barat dalam Konstruksi Pemberitaan Tempo.co. *Jurnal Kajian Jurnalisme*, *5*(1), 48. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v5i1.31885>.
- McCullagh, C. B. (2000). Bias in Historical Description, Interpretation, and Explanation. *History and Theory*, *39*(1), 39–66.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2677997>.
- Meteray, B. (2020). Pertumbuhan Nasionalisme Indonesia Di Kalangan Orang Papua 1963-1969. *Masyarakat Indonesia ; Majalah Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, *45*(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14203/jmi.v45i1.883>.
- Mukhtadi. (2021). Strategi Pemerintah dalam Penanganan Gerakan Separatis Papua dan Implikasinya terhadap Diplomasi Pertahanan Indonesia. *Jurnal Diplomasi Pertahanan*, *7*(2), 2021.  
<http://jurnalprodi.idu.ac.id/index.php/DP/article/view/729>.
- Mulyadi, M., Prakoso, L. Y., & Mudhio, I. W. (2021). Konfrontasi Militer Pembebasan Papua Barat Dalam Perspektif Strategi Perang Semesta. *Jurnal Inovasi Penelitian*, *2*(1), 265–276.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47492/jip.v2i1.635>.
- Ningsih, L., Hasudungan, A. N., & Nababan, S. A. (2022). Mama Papua's Role in The Socio-Economic Society: Case Study of The Dani Tribe In Jayawijaya Regency, Papua, Indonesia. *Revista Direito e Sexualidade*, *3*(1), 167–182.  
<https://doi.org/10.9771/revdirsex.v3i1.47693>.
- Noor, F. (2018). Analisis Terhadap Kebijakan Pemerintah Tentang Separatisme Papua. *Jurnal Pertahanan & Bela Negara*, *6*(3), 19–46.  
<https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v6i3.313>.

- Parera, A. M. F., Usmany, D. P., Saberina, & Sinaga, R. (2013). *Sausapor Saksi Sejarah Perang Dunia II di Kabupaten Tambrau Provinsi Papua Barat*. Kepel Press.
- Permana, P. (2016, May 15). Membangun Papua dalam Kerangka Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. *Batamtoday.Com*. <https://batamtoday.com/home/read/71827/membangun-papua-dalam-kerangka-bhinneka-tunggal-ika>.
- Pigai, N. (2014). Solusi Damai Di Tanah Papua (Mengubur Tragedi Ham Dan Mencari Jalan Kedamaian). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 11(2), 23–38. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/72813-ID-solusi-damai-di-tanah-papua-mengubur-tra.pdf>.
- Saravanamuttu, J. (2009). Islam and Politics in Southeast Asia. In J. Saravanamuttu (Ed.), *Islam and Politics in Southeast Asia*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203861325>.
- Scott, C., & Tebay, N. (2005). The West Papua conflict and its consequences for the Island of New Guinea: Root causes and the campaign for Papua, land of peace. *The Round Table*, 94(382), 599–612. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358530500331826>.
- Strating, R. (2014). Contested Self-determination: Indonesia and East Timor's Battle over Borders, International Law and Ethnic Identity. *The Journal of Pacific History*, 49(4), 469–494. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24644651>.
- Suter, K. (2001). Indonesia: Independence for West Papua? *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 57(3), 16–18. <https://doi.org/10.2968/057003005>.
- Taum, Y. Y. (2015). Kekerasan dan Konflik di Papua: Akar Masalah dan Strategi Mengatasinya. *Jurnal Penelitian*, 19(1), 1–13. <https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/JP/article/view/980/759>.
- tempo.co. (2019, May). Masuknya Papua ke NKRI Digugat ke MK Meski Jokowi Sudah Berkali-kali ke Sana. *Tempo.Co*. <https://www.tempo.co/abc/4132/masuknya-papua-ke-nkri-digugat-ke-mk-meski-jokowi-sudah-berkali-kali-ke-sana>.
- van der Veur, P. W. (1964). The United Nations in West Irian: A Critique. *International Organization*, 18(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300000369>.
- Webster, D. (2013). Self-Determination Abandoned: The Road to the New York Agreement on West New Guinea (Papua), 1960–62. *Indonesia*, 95, 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.5728/indonesia.95.0009>.
- Wirajuda, M. H. (2014). *The Impact of Democratisation on Indonesia's Foreign Policy: Regional Cooperation, Promotion of Political Values, and Conflict Management* (Issue August) [London School of Economics and Political Science]. [http://etheses.lse.ac.uk/992/1/Wirajuda\\_Impact\\_of\\_Democratisation\\_on\\_Indonesias\\_Foreign\\_Policy.pdf](http://etheses.lse.ac.uk/992/1/Wirajuda_Impact_of_Democratisation_on_Indonesias_Foreign_Policy.pdf).
- Yoman, S. S. (2013). *Apakah Indonesia Menduduki Dan Menjajah Bangsa Papua?: Tantangan Dan Harapan Masa Depan Bangsa Papua Dalam Pelaksanaan*

*Nasionalisme Keindonesiaan Dan Imperialisme Kapitalis Di Papua*. Cenderawasih Press.

- Zahidi, M. S., & Pradana, H. A. (2020). Pola Relasi Hukum Internasional Dan Negara Pada Perundingan Masalah Papua Barat Tahun 1950- 1962. *Dauliyah Journal of Islamic and International Affairs*, 5(1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.21111/dauliyah.v5i1.4275>.
- Zuhdi, S. (2018). Historiografi dan Metodologi Sejarah. *Buletin Al-Turas*, 2(2), 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.15408/bat.v2i4.6872>.