



P-ISSN : 2502-7875 E-ISSN : 2527-5879  
<http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jsph>  
Email: [jsphum@yahoo.co.id](mailto:jsphum@yahoo.co.id)

Volume 2, Nomor 2, Desember 2017

Halaman 88-95

---

## PARADOKS PEMBANGUNAN DALAM KEMISKINAN STRUKTURAL DI PAPUA

Ica Wulansari

Pascasarjana Sosiologi Universitas Padjajaran

Email: [ica.wulansari3@gmail.com](mailto:ica.wulansari3@gmail.com)

---

### Abstrak

Artikel ini bertujuan untuk melihat kemiskinan struktural di Papua. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah studi literatur tentang Papua, dimulai dengan pemeriksaan terhadap kebijakan pembangunan untuk Papua sejak era Orde Baru hingga saat ini. Berdasarkan temuan, ada kesamaan paradigma pembangunan Papua pada masa orde baru dan era reformasi. Papua dianggap tak lebih sebagai objek pembangunan. Hal ini terbukti dengan adanya operasi perusahaan tambang multinasional yang mengarah ke beberapa kekerasan terhadap orang Papua yang disebabkan oleh pendekatan militer yang digunakan oleh pemerintah. Pelaksanaan otonomi khusus di Papua menjanjikan pembangunan yang dipercepat. Namun, di tengah-tengah pelaksanaan otonomi khusus yang gagal, pemerintah memberlakukan paradigma lain yang menyerahkan kebijakan pembangunan pengelolaan pangan dan energi kepada pihak swasta melalui proyek-proyek besar bernama MIFEE (Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate). MIFEE menawarkan beberapa mimpi kosong dengan dalih untuk membangun makanan Indonesia kepada dunia. Bahkan, kebijakan itu tidak dimaksudkan untuk mendukung kehidupan orang Papua. Oleh karena itu, kemiskinan di Papua semakin akut karena kebijakan pemerintah atas nama pembangunan ekonomi kurang aspek sosial.

---

**Kata kunci:** papua; kemiskinan; pembangunan; kebijakan; pemerintah.

---

## THE PARADOX OF DEVELOPMENT ON STRUCTURAL POVERTY IN PAPUA

---

### Abstract

This article seeks to examine the structural poverty in Papua. The method used in this study is a literature study on Papua, starting with the examination on the development policy for Papua since the New Order era up to present. Based on the findings, there are similarities on the development paradigm of Papua during the new order and reform order era. Papua is considered the object of the development. It is evident with the existence of multinational mining company operations leading to some violence to the Papuans caused by the military approach used by the government. The implementation of special autonomy in Papua promised an accelerated development. However, in the middle of the unsuccessful implementation of special autonomy, the government imposed another paradigm which handed development policy on food and energy management to private parties through big projects named MIFEE (Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate). MIFEE offers some empty dreams with a pretext to build Indonesian food to the world. In fact, the policy is not intended to support the life of Papuans. Hence, poverty in Papua is increasingly acute because of the government policy on behalf of the economic development lacking of social aspects.

---

**Keywords:** papua, poverty, development, policy, government.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Papua is the easternmost province of Indonesia which has the twists and turns of a long history and full of political violence. Papua is rich in natural resources but has no effect on improving the welfare of the people of Papua. Papua has been designated as a Special Autonomous Region since January 7, 2002 through the Law No. 21 Year of 2001 which provides greater authority to the province of Papua to take care of autonomous regions (Bhakti & Pigay, 2012). Special autonomy is not yet a significant impact on the increase in infrastructure development that supports people's welfare.

In 2013, the writer had the opportunity to visit Jayapura Regency. Classic problems such as road infrastructure, schools and health facilities are serious problems in Papua. One example is SD and SMP 1 Atap of Christian Education Foundation, located in the village Kanda district of Waibu in Jayapura Regency, with their shortage of teachers and the school buildings were damaged. It is one example that damaged educational facilities and the shortage of teachers are 'normal' in Papua. Not only education, health problem becomes serious also. The rate of HIV and AIDS in Papua are the highest in Indonesia. Data from the Directorate General PP & PL Ministry of Health of Indonesia in 2014, people living with HIV in Papua reached 21.4747 people and AIDS patients reached 13.335 people.

The lack of public facilities have an impact on poverty in Papua. Based on the data of SUSENAS in March 2016, Papua was placed with the highest percentage of poor people in Indonesia amounted to 28.54 percent. Similarly, the regional division of Papua, the West Papua province occupy the second rank of poverty in Indonesia amounted to 25.43 percent. Meanwhile, according to Statistics News from BPS (Central Bureau of Statistics), the Papua Province claimed that the implementation of Special Autonomy is able to lower the poverty rate by 4.72 percent. The percentage of poor people occurred in the period March 2010-March 2011 amounted to 4.82 percent.

However, in the past year, the percentage of poor people in Papua increased by 0.37 percent.

Although official data show Papua poverty has decreased, but the fact is social and political upheavals in Papua is still quite high. The turmoil dissatisfaction on implementation of Special Autonomy was still strong among the public so that gave rise to the independence discourse from Indonesia which is still quite strong. Even the internationalization effort of the case was still strong that indicates foreign support for those who want independence from Indonesia. In addition, the development policy of the Indonesian government has not shown partiality to the welfare of the people of Papua. This paper seeks to examine the government's development policy that causes impoverishment for the people of Papua.

## CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Modernization theory is a theory that supports by the development paradigm with the application of capitalism that drives economic growth. Modernization encourages social change, which is based on industrialization that pushes traditionalism becomes modern imitating the developed countries. Proponent of modernization theory is Theory of Economic Growth of W.W. Rostow and Achievement Motive Theory and Economic Growth of David McClelland. Both theories are bracing modernization emphasize the homogeneity of the developing countries that are 'required' to follow the development system of the developed countries (Fakih, 2001). Modernization then stamped to boost economic growth through the income per capita (GNP). However, the fact that for developing countries, the construction style of modernization has been perpetuating unemployment, poverty and the unequal distribution of development.

Modernization sought to show the arguments regarding a solution to alleviate poverty is through growth per capita. A way to increase the growth per capita by providing space for multinational companies and agribusiness. In addition, other efforts are systematization suppress wages, increase the

cost of capital, handing the exchange rate to the market and increase the prices of agricultural (Fakih, 2001). In fact, the implementation of modernization in Indonesia, especially in Papua regarding the operations of multinational companies do not necessarily pose an immediate impact for the welfare of Papuans. In reality, the contradiction raises social and political issues. This will be discussed in further discussion. Related to the concept of progress brought about by modernization, Immanuel Wallerstein offers some flaw in the concept is the concept of the impressive social process that there are fluctuating, reversed or stopped, then its direction cannot be predicted. Other defects are overly optimistic assumptions about the development process that produces continuous improvement (Sztompka, 2004).

Indicators to determine the success of development is through an average wealth. The average wealth of a country is realized through the income per capita of population. The per capita income is the value of goods and services produced by a country's population (national) for one year; including the production of goods and services produced citizens who are abroad, but not including the production of foreign companies operating in the territory of the country (Martono, 2011). The calculation of income per capita emphasis on factors including education level, income country, and population. Another way to measure poverty than through the income per capita is using the Gini Coefficient. The biggest constraint in the development in Indonesia is the problem of economic inequality. In 2013, Indonesia reached 0.41 Gini Index, increased from 0.32 in 2003. The Gini Index was the highest for Indonesia. Ironically, the growth in Indonesia in 2013 reached 6 percent but reached a Gini Index of 0.41. Such condition indicates a high economic gap between the rich and the poor (Abdoellah, 2016).

Results of development through income per capita and the Gini Coefficient indicate the problem of poverty. Development is actually an attempt to advance the citizens, but the negative impacts of development always appears. One of

the negative impacts is poverty due to income inequality. There is a kind of poverty that is affected by external elements that structural poverty. Structural poverty that defines the poverty suffered a class society because the social structure cannot opt out of the sources of revenue available. These communities have difficulty accessing public facilities such as education, health, communications and other facilities (Martono, 2011).

Nowadays, poverty is universal because it is not considered as an individual problem, but a problem of regency, provincial, national and even global. Poverty becomes legitimate to be managed by the state. The strength of discourse on poverty in Indonesia is indicated by a shift in the economic structure of domination contribution of agriculture into manufacturing in GNP in 1991 and ahead of the planned take-off stage in Repelita V. Later in the Soeharto era, poverty alleviation that was introduced followed by poverty alleviation program in 1993. This discourse has become a cornerstone of the emergence of the poor (Agusta, 2014).

## **METHOD**

This article is using qualitative method to describe causal relation of the main issue as the object of the research. The secondary data has been collected through literature review from books, journal and media information. The description of this article use qualitative method which is chronologically of history and structural process in term of poverty issue. The poverty issue in Papua is a critical development issue in Indonesia along New Order Regime until the transition to democracy as popularly known as Reform Regime.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **The Government's Development Policy : PT Freeport Operation**

The security approach in Papua during the New Order era was more focused on military security with the implementation of military operations. Military approach was the priority over humanitarian approach. Papua society traumatized by the military presence. They are

more in need of teachers and medical personnel to ensure the education and health levels. However, the government argued the military approach to security threats in the form of interference quell separatism. Separatism was triggered as a result of political discontent and distribution leads to lower economic welfare of the people of Papua.

Papua's natural wealth becomes a paradox compared to the high rate of poverty in Papua. PT Freeport Indonesia began operating in Mimika Regency, Papua Province since 1967, with a work contract valid for 30 years. In 1991, the work contract of PT Freeport was extended to 50 years from the start of the first works contract. This works contract includes the mining area of PT Freeport covering area of 2.6 million hectares with an area of previous exploration reached 203 thousand hectares. This includes digging mines of gold, silver, copper and other follow-up material. The majority of shares of PT Freeport Indonesia is owned by Freeport-McMoRan Copper & Gold Inc., with the percentage as much as 90.64 percent. Ironically, the Indonesian government controls a percentage of 9.36 percent only (Hamsky, 2014).

In October 2010, there was a general strike of workers of PT Freeport Indonesia, demanding a wage increase. But the strike has led to violent clashes. At that time, Papua churned when the implementation of the Papuan Congress ended in violence by security forces. In the midst of the warmth of the security issues in Papua, police chief admitted receiving funds from PT Freeport Indonesia. According to National Police Chief, Gen. Timur Pradopo, the operational costs for troops in Papua were not entirely from PT Freeport, but also financed by the state. Money from PT Freeport Indonesia were received as extra pocket money because of the difficult situation in the conflict region (Wulansari, 2012). The demonstration was understandable considering the operation of PT Freeport Indonesia studded big advantage, but had no impact on the increase in employee wages and improved welfare for Papuans. On December 20, 2010, the Grasberg mine reserves

are controlled by PT Freeport Indonesia with a copper content of 0.98 percent, 0.83 percent gold, silver and 4.11 percent. In its financial statement, PT Freeport Indonesia sell 1.2 billion pounds of copper and 1,8 million ounces of gold at an exchange rate of Rp. 9000, the profits reached Rp. 60.01 trillion (Bhakti & Pigay, 2012).

In addition to the rise of the security forces on duty in Papua, Freeport operation is more about political motives. Among them is the scandal of 'papa minta shares' involving House Speaker Novanto which subsequently led to his resignation as public officials under public pressure at that time. Although, up to this writing, Novanto serves again as Speaker of the House. Confusion over the scandal also led to efforts revision of Government Regulation 77 of 2014 concerning Third Amendment to Government Regulation No. 23 of 2010 by the government to extend the contract of work PT Freeport until 2021 (REPUBLIKA, 2015).

The operation of PT Freeport has displaced Amungme indigenous land area of 2,6 million hectares. In addition, there are several mountain has been lost as a result of this exploration (Amiruddin & de Soares, 2003). The existence of PT Freeport Indonesia displacing the culture of life and patterns to the Amungme. However, the social impact to the Amungme did not receive some proper attention from the government (KOMPAS, 2015). The government seemed to negate social impacts resulting from the operation of the corporation. This is evidenced by the lack of information and data that raised the issue of remoteness and social impacts of the tribe who were deterred by the presence of PT Freeport Indonesia, which is published by the Indonesian government.

### **Special Otonomy**

Increased political tensions at the beginning of the reform period, prompting President B.J. Habibie to receive the Team 100 comprising representatives of Papuans who have expressed a desire for independence from Indonesia. The government responded by making the Law No. 45 of 1999 regarding the division of Irian Jaya. However, the regulation is

met with resistance from the people of Papua and the massive demonstrations in various parts of Papua. The government changed later in the era of President Abdurrahman Wahid by passing the Law No.21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for Papua that was intended to improve public services, accelerate the development process and empower the entire population of the province of Papua (Sugandi, 2008).

Total fund of Special Autonomy in 2002-2009 is Rp. 9.353 trillion for infrastructure development from 2007 to 2009 with funds reached Rp. 2.5 trillion. But the special autonomy has not brought greater prosperity. In addition, the rate of inflation and the high cost of living becomes constraint problems welfare of Papuans. Price stability in Papua is attributed rising inflation every year, also due to the mileage distribution of goods and services from production centers to the Province of Papua is very far and thus costly. Additionally, road and bridge infrastructure are problems in Papua that do not have adequate gran design. Thus, remote and isolated areas are still difficult to be penetrated by many people (Bakti & Pigay, 2012).

The good intention of government to provide the Special Autonomy for Papua was not enough to overcome the problems of poverty in Papua. Consistency of implementation and supervision is needed for corruption loopholes in the implementation of special autonomy is quite high because there has been no rigorous surveillance system. In addition, the seriousness of the government to make room for the determination of social life for the people of Papua has not done well. Special autonomy more than a decade cannot be issued Papua from poverty and underdevelopment.

### **MIFEE Policy**

In 2006, President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono launched a project to boost rice production in the Merauke regency named MIRE (Merauke Integrated Rice Estate). During the administration of Yudhoyono, Indonesia seems to be eager to make the eastern part of Indonesia as a rice mill through the planting of foreign investment. Then in 2010, changed its

name into MIRE (Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate). (Suryani, 2016). MIFEE was strengthened through Government Regulation (PP) No. 28 of 2008 which makes Merauke as the center of the project and split the six main areas. Later in 2010, the government again issued the Regulation No. 18 of 2010 which gives emphasis to the implementation MIFEE (Barahamin, 2015). Based on information from the page of the Ministry of Public Works, MIFEE implementation started in 2011 with a span of 20 years. The Papua provincial government poured agricultural sector development plans Papua province were allocated land in the Merauke regency covering an area of 552,316 hectares (Dewi, 2012).

The vision of President Yudhoyono voiced to the public is to build Indonesian food for the world. So far there was some impression for the development of Indonesia's food security, but in fact nothing more MIFEE development as a field of capitalism to exploit the name of development. So far, as many as 36 investors have secured concessions (Dewi, 2012). Most are from Indonesia but the company Japan, Korea, Singapore and the Middle East are involved in the project MIFEE. MIFEE not leave room for land for planting sago which is the staple food of the people of Papua. MIFEE make room for palm plantation, corn, soybeans, sugar cane and wood processing. Until mid-2011 more than 12 investors who obtain permission to MIFEE to have started work in the concession area. Location concessions by regency of Merauke is located in Ngguti, Okaba, Tubang, Ulilin, Kaptel, Muting, Jagebon, Land Leaning, Kurik, Ilwayab, Malind, and Semangga (Dewi, 2012).

MIFEE poses a serious threat to the local community. That is because the indigenous people receive lower compensation payments as compensation delivery of the estate passed down and become part of their cultural heritage. Land acquisition process is not transparent with intimidation and threats of security thanks to the military presence (Yanuarti, 2012). The process of opening MIFEE repeat history as land clearing for Freeport. MIFEE projects

implemented because the government's policy to invite investors to carry out the expropriation of land by pressing the customary community groups.

The government enacted the Presidential Regulation No. 40 of 2013 regarding Roads in Order to Accelerate the Development of Papua and West Papua to build roads, bridges and other infrastructure projects to pave MIFEE. However, to build the infrastructure for Papuans and isolated parts of Merauke, the government has not effectively build and wholeheartedly. MIFEE development for the sake of acceptance of foreign investment, the infrastructure is built only for limited interest. In fact, the government does not intervene related compensation they receive are lower. Then various government policies are then pushed efforts to impoverishment. Voters chose terminology systematic impoverishment because there is an attempt to generate pro-poverty policy of foreign investment development.

### **Impoverishment of Indigenous Papuans *Amungme Tribe***

Since 1967, the Amungme and Kamoro have lost their land area of 100,000 hectares while the operation of PT Freeport Indonesia began. A few years later, between the years 1983-1985, they again lost the land area of 7,000 hectares for the establishment of the town of Timika. In 1991, PT Freeport contract of work has explored an area of 2.6 million hectares for the purposes of the establishment of the city with a capacity of 1,500 people and an airfield within 22 miles of the sea port. For workers, Freeport set up a means of settlement at the site within 10 km of mining. The current location is known as Tembagapura. Later, the land area of 25,000 hectares back lost for the establishment of the city of Kuala Kencana, which was inaugurated by President Soeharto in 1997 (Amiruddin & de Soares, 2003).

During the establishment of various infrastructure, Freeport did not involve Amungme. In fact, all of Freeport workers, ranging from leadership, managers to unskilled laborers coming from outside Timika. Similarly,

the various materials used for the manufacture of infrastructure, mining construction, and buildings. All the machinery and equipment imported from the United States and Japan. In fact, groceries and everyday needs of the workers and expert staff Freeport was imported from Singapore and Australia. It seems that since the beginning of Freeport is designed to be a convenient settlement for foreign residents in the middle of the Amungme.

At the time of Freeport began operating in 1972, the tribe Amungme leave ancestral land in the mountains and controlled Freeport. Amungme then moved to Agimugah. After that, in the 1980s the whole territory of the unity of the Amungme incorporated into the National Park area Lorents. At this time, the Amungme have low confidence against the chief appointed by the government. In fact, the chiefs were often identified as land brokers, because in every release of land, tribal people were never invited to contribute our thoughts and never happen agreement on the release of land a fair price. Before the entry of Freeport, customary chiefs appointed by the Amungme in order to protect their livelihoods (Amiruddin & de Soares, 2003).

Intimidation of Amungme voiced through citizen lawsuit against PT Freeport Indonesia on August 12, 1996. The document contains a signature of the representative of the Amungme, Dani, Moni, Nduga, Kamoro and Ekari totaling 2,000 signatures (Amiruddin & de Soares, 2003). As a form of resistance against Freeport who usurp the rights of Papuans so that the residents do not have to stay home. Not only robs the land of life, military intimidation and violence for indigenous people when it fought against the operation of PT Freeport. In addition, the Amungme miss the mountains in the area of Grasberg is a sacred place as confidence Amungme. Operations PT Freeport also helped curb disrupt socio-cultural system Amungme.

### ***Malind Anim Tribe***

The opening of MIFEE project has made the removal of some tribes in Merauke, including tribal Malind, Muyu, Mandobo, Mappi and Asmat. Mandobo and Muyu inhabit

the northern part bordering Boven Digul and Mappi and Asmat tribe located in the northwestern part with Mappi. As a large forest and river in Merauke, a cultural area Malind-Anim. Land clearing MIFEE threaten the existence of sources of food such as sago, game animals and fruits for these tribes. Similar to the Amungme, Malind Anim tribe was displaced to carry out religious activities because the loss of land seized by capitalist interests (Barahamin, 2015).

Anim Malind attachment to the forest can be identified by surname meaning Malind-Anim through a plant or animal in the forest. MIFEE development is a form of cultural annihilation against Malind Anim tribe and other tribes in Merauke. Takeover of forest is not for the benefit of tribes, because the government will be concentrated planting of oil palm, rice and sugar cane. For the sake of energy policy and the government's food (only) for the investor, the government took 4.5 million hectares, or more than 55 percent of the land to be converted by the corporation (Barahamin, 2015).

From 2007 to 2013, the government has given permission to 80 companies for the location of the project MIFEE. The project for the construction of roads, bridges and irrigation canals is not for the benefit of citizens, but to support the movement of goods and resources to ease MIFEE project. Malind Anim tribe suffered losses due to take over public land with the low compensation of Rp. 2,000 to \$ 3,000 thousand per hectare for 35 years. Malind people around the company also lost their livelihoods. They become unskilled laborers with piece rate below decent living standards Rp. 70 thousand per day. MIFEE any company under the protection of security forces and cause intimidation and inequality for the tribes living around the project area MIFEE (MONGABAY, 2013).

## CONCLUSIONS

Poverty becomes something that is familiar as the impact of development for Papua. Development in Papua has not shown a commitment to justice that support prosperity for Papuans. Regime change of government has

not shown a paradigm shift in the development of Papua. Human touch through the development of pro-social justice in Papua is still far from expectations. During Papuans have trouble accessibility of public infrastructure, during the same pace will continue. So, the next condition will cause the Papuans increasingly marginalized socially, politically and culturally.

Poverty in Papua occurs systemically through development policies that have an impact on social life in Papua. Papua community groups such as the tribe bond appears to not have a 'right' and its recognition as citizens when the government perpetuates violence through corporate operations that seize the land and the lives of citizens. The tribal groups become marginal parties being forced to follow the rules of the government in the name of development. While the state neglected its obligations in providing fulfillment services to education and other public services for the people of Papua. Development policies for Papua appears to be genuine because it just makes the fields of exploitation to satisfy the economic and political interests of a few political elites and business groups.

## REFERENCES

- Abdoellah, Oekan S. (2016). *Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Di Indonesia Di persimpangan Jalan*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Agusta, Ivanovich. (2014). *Diskursus, Kekuasaan, dan Praktik Kemiskinan Di Pedesaan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Amiruddin & de Soares, Aderito Jesus. (2003). *Perjuangan Amungme Antara Freeport dan Militer*. Jakarta: ELSAM.
- Bhakti, Ikrar Nusa & Pigay, Natalius. (2012). *Menemukan Akar Masalah dan Solusi Atas Konflik Papua: Supenkah?* Jurnal Penelitian Politik, 9(1), 1-18. <http://ejournal.politik.lipi.go.id/index.php/jpp/article/view/443/256>

- Barahamin, Andre. (2015). *Hikayat Beras Pemangsa Sagu: Etnosida Terhadap Malind-Anim Melalui Mega Proyek MIFEE*. Harian Indoprogres. <https://indoprogres.com/2015/10/hikayat-beras-pemangsa-sagu-etnosida-terhadap-malind-anim-melalui-mega-proyek-miffee/>
- Dewi, Rosita. (2012). *Dilema Percepatan Pembangunan dan Permasalahan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Dalam Pelaksanaan MIFEE di Merauke*. Jurnal Penelitian Politik, 9 (1), 47-57.
- Fakih, Mansour. (2001). *Runtuhnya Teori Pembangunan dan Globalisasi*. Yogyakarta: Insist Press.
- Hamsky, Ratih. (2014). *Dampak Operasional PT. Freeport Pada Kehidupan Suku Kamoro*. Jurnal Ilmu Hubungan Internasional Universitas Mulawarman, 2 (2), 411-426.
- KOMPAS. (2015). *Tokoh Adat Papua Desak Freeport Segera Bayar Ganti Rugi 20,8 Miliar Dollar AS*. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2015/09/15/14380551/Tokoh.Adat.Papua.Desak.Freeport.Segera.Bayar.Ganti.Rugi.20.8.Miliar.Dollar.AS>
- Martono, Nanang. (2011). *Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial. Perspektif Klasik, Modern, Posmodern dan Poskolonial*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Perkasa.
- MONGABAY. (2013). *27 Organisasi Desak PBB Perhatikan Suku Malind Anim yang Terancam MIFEE*. <http://www.mongabay.co.id/2013/07/25/27-organisasi-desak-pbb-perhatikan-suku-malind-yang-terancam-miffee/>
- REPUBLIKA. (2015). *Kontrak Karya PT. Freeport Resmi Diperpanjang*. <http://www.republika.co.id/berita/ekonomi/makro/15/10/09/nvyjppq354-kontrak-karya-pt-freeport-resmi-diperpanjang>
- Sugandi, Yulia. (2008). *Analisis Konflik dan Rekomendasi Kebijakan Mengenai Papua*. Jakarta: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Suryani, Dini. (2016). *Structural Violation of Indigenous Human Rights In Indonesia: A Case Study of Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate (MIFEE) In Papua*. Jurnal Masyarakat & Budaya, 18 (1), 97-108.
- Sztompka, Piotr. (2004). *Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Wulansari, Ica. (2012). *Penyelesaian Politik Sebagai Alternatif Pendekatan Keamanan di Papua*. Jurnal Hubungan Internasional INSIGNIA, Volume 2, 21-36.
- Yanuarti, Sri. (2012). *Kemiskinan dan Konflik Papua Di Tengah Sumber Daya Yang Melimpah*. Jurnal Penelitian Politik, 9 (1), 33-46.