

## **Reviewing the Prosperity Tracks After Two Decades of Special Autonomy for Papua**

**Hendy Setiawan**

Program Studi Ilmu Pemerintahan Fisip Universitas Selamat Sri  
✉Jalan Batang – Semarang KM.14 Clapar, Subah, Batang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia  
E-mail: [hendvsetiawan2020@mail.uem.ac.id](mailto:hendvsetiawan2020@mail.uem.ac.id)

---

### **Article Info**

#### *Article History*

Received:  
Nov 2021  
Accepted:  
Feb 2022  
Published:  
March 2022

#### *Keywords:*

*Special Autonomy,  
Welfare, Public Service*

---

### **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study is to discuss the impact of the implementation of special autonomy which has been running for two decades on welfare in Papua through the public service sector. Law Number 21 of 2001 which became the initial basis for the implementation of special autonomy in Papua is an instrument to encourage Papua to catch up with other regions in Indonesia. So far, Papua has been an area that tends to be left behind in various sectors, including its public services. Therefore, the presence of special autonomy, which is then followed by special autonomy funding that significantly increases every year, is expected to be able to improve public services to achieve prosperity. This study uses a qualitative method with a literature study approach. Data were collected from various literature, both from relevant agencies and the relevant media. Meanwhile, researchers in conducting research stages use the Creswell concept. The stages of this research consist of problem identification, literature search, research aims and objectives, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and research reporting. The results of the study show that two decades of implementing special autonomy in Papua have not provided significant achievements for public services. High poverty rates, low Human Development Index and minimal public service facilities are still the main characteristics of the implementation after the two decades of autonomy. The implication is that there is a negative correlation between the implementation of this special autonomy and the welfare aspect to date. Therefore, the disbursement of funds that enter from the centre to the regions through this regulatory scheme has not had a significant impact on welfare in Papua.

© 2022 Politeknik Negeri Bali

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this study is to track the extent to which the implementation of special autonomy in Papua has contributed to encouraging the development and development of the various

problems that have been experienced by Papua so far. Issues of education, health, economy, society, and others have coloured the turmoil that occurred in Papua. This causes Papua to fall behind in many ways, so it needs to be encouraged to be aligned with other regions that have experienced development progress. Therefore, this special autonomy is presented as the expectation of many parties to cover all the gaps with the support of various funds pouring in from the centre, for example through special autonomy funds. In principle, with the existence of this large fiscal capacity, the rationale is to become a trigger for the development of conditions in Papua. In addition, this special autonomy for Papua is present at the same time to provide the widest opportunity for Papuans to resolve the problems they are experiencing so that the local government better understands what must be done (Achmady, 2020).

After running for more than two decades, special autonomy for Papua still seems to be running in place without bringing changes to welfare. The design of special autonomy which was originally designed by the Central Government to develop Papua to be equal to other regions does not seem to have worked as expected. It is as if the presence of special autonomy does not become a middle ground for the Papua issue, but instead triggers a new conflict. For Papua, this special autonomy journey which was then followed by special autonomy funding provides a not-so-encouraging note for the face of welfare in Papua. For two decades of special autonomy implemented in Papua, it has not provided significant changes for development in all fields in Papua. This is ironic because Papua is a region with a dimming level of welfare amid the wealth of natural resources it has (Kambu, 2019). This is what many people call Papua the "paradox of plenty". From a rational perspective, it is difficult to imagine how Papua with its rich natural resources hinders Papua's development (Tadjoeddin, 2007). Is this the failure of government institutions in managing natural resources?

Although in this context, various ecological political experts have studied how the influence of the natural resource wealth of a region inhibits, creates conflict, and even impoverishes a region in question, such as the study from Gelb, Billon, Mehlum et al and Auty (Gelb, 1989; Billon, 2001; Mehlum et al., 2005; Auty, 2005). However, in the case of Papua's special autonomy, there are similarities in that apart from Papua being a region rich in natural resources, it also benefits from this special autonomy scheme in terms of asymmetrical fiscal decentralization capacity, especially to boost its welfare. But why is Papua still not prosperous with a pattern of arrangement that benefits him?

Especially with the presence of special autonomy which is predicted by the Central Government to be able to change the direction and face of welfare development for Papua for the better. The spirit of special autonomy is not in line with the conditions that are still happening in the Land of Papua today, namely the hope that the ideal situation dreamed of by the government of the Republic of Indonesia is still far from the truth. (Marit & Warami, 2018). In principle, various forms of the asymmetrical distribution of authority are one of the policy instruments intended to address two fundamental issues facing a country, namely issues of a political nature, including those originating from cultural uniqueness and differences; and problems with a technocratic-managerial pattern, namely the limited capacity of a region or a region in carrying out basic government functions (Permatasari, 2014).

In addition, the spirit of special autonomy is also intended as a tool to reduce the span of control, improve public services, equitable development, and improve community welfare, as well as create efficiency and effectiveness in the management of regional resources. (Aziz & Eng, 2019). The question that then arises is that during the two decades of special autonomy carried out in Papua, how far does this policy design span the control over the complexity of welfare development in Papua? How much does this special autonomy contribute to improving Papua from all its adversity and backwardness so far? Law No. 21 of 2001 which is now the basis for the implementation of special autonomy in Papua in the rationality of the central government, namely as a step in providing a way to solve all problems for Papua by looking at the socio-political conditions that have quite a sharp gap (Tabuni et al., 2016).

However, it turns out that the output of this policy did not work well, such as in regions that received asymmetrical autonomy; for instance, DI Yogyakarta, Aceh, and DKI Jakarta. Historically, it must be acknowledged that asymmetric policies or arrangements in both Aceh and Papua are a long negotiation process over the struggle for resources (Permatasari, 2014). Seeing the wealth of resources in both Aceh and Papua, which are very rich, the government is reluctant to release them. Therefore, the negotiations between the central government and Papua and Aceh gave birth to Law No. 21 of 2001 for Papua and Law No. 44 of 1999 concerning the Implementation of the Privileges of the Province of the Special Region of Aceh and Law No. 11 of 2006 concerning the Government of Aceh. The regulation works quite well in Aceh with many notes, but not for Papua. Why has Papua's special autonomy become an ongoing conflict and it seems that it is unable to build prosperity through the development of its public services? Is public service not seen as an aspect that must be addressed in realizing prosperity for the Papuan people?

One of the main essences that must be understood is that welfare in Papua will be realized, one of them is by improving public services. Improvements are not only in terms of quantity but also quality. These two things should be a barometer of how far these two decades of special autonomy have contributed to the development of better public services. Through the regulation of Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Papua Province (Bertrand, 2019), the government not only provides special rights in terms of politics but also provides economic facilities in the form of balancing funds in the context of special autonomy to improve the welfare of Papua. This is aimed at accelerating its implementation in the context of realizing justice, upholding the rule of law, respecting human rights, accelerating economic development, improving the welfare and progress of the Papuan people (S & Saleh, 2017).

The implementation of special autonomy in Papua based on Law Number 21 of 2001 as amended by Law Number 35 of 2008 requires that the Central Government allocate 2% of the national General Allocation Fund (DAU) for Papua's special autonomy. 70% of the 2% DAU is allocated to Papua Province and 30% of the 2% DAU is allocated to West Papua Province. The funds are allocated for the education sector at least 30%, the health sector at least 15%, the infrastructure sector at least 20%, the planning, monitoring, and evaluation sector a maximum of 2%, and a maximum of 2% for other sectors. This scheme was developed in the context of accelerating Papua's development with all considerations apart from being lagging but also having abundant natural resources so that this special autonomy scheme can trigger the performance of local government to respond and improve various communities. There is a tendency for the implementation of special autonomy in Papua to fail to be implemented properly, many Papuans

are still disappointed, and conflicts, the level of violence is still going on. (Bertrand, 2019). This means that even though this scheme has brought Papua to be better, however, in terms of the welfare indicators of this special autonomy, each of them faces big challenges (Resosudarmo et al., 2014)

In simple terms, the formulation of the problem in this research that will be answered is how the implications of the two decades post-special autonomy on the development of welfare in Papua. So far, special autonomy is mostly studied in the paradigm of political economy, good governance, bureaucratization, and institutionalism. The author tries to see how welfare relations in Papua will be built and directly proportional to the development of welfare. This means that to create prosperity in Papua, the development of public services is the key that must be passed.

Furthermore, this research is important to do because there is a sufficient gap between what should happen with the actual reality. Through this special autonomy scheme with extraordinary fiscal support, Papua should be able to catch up with all the lags that have been maintained until now. But interestingly, in reality, there is a tendency that this special autonomy arrangement has no impact on development for the welfare of Papua (Pratama, 2015). This is reinforced by BPS 2021 data where the percentage of Papua is the highest nationally. This is what is interesting about what has happened to the implementation of special autonomy during these two decades.

## **METHODS**

This type of research uses a qualitative approach with a literature study method. Through this approach, the author believes that in qualitative research, truth is something dynamic and can be sought through an in-depth understanding of the object studied. The use of the literature study method in this research has at least two advantages. First, through this method, it will be easier for researchers to collect various data both from data sourced from the library, such as authorized authorities, media, books, journals, or other sources relevant to the topic being studied in this research. Second, through this method, the researcher has the freedom to interpret the data by comparing it to the reality of the research object being studied. This research was conducted by collecting data from July 1, 2021, to October 10, 2021. The object that is used as the locus in this research is the implementation of special autonomy in response to the development of public services in Papua. The reason the research locus was chosen is that so far, the approach used in understanding the special autonomy policy is still using a general approach, such as institutionalism, bureaucracy, conflict resolution, good governance, and public policy.

Departing from the many approaches in understanding the special autonomy policy, the researcher will try a new approach, namely welfare based on public services as an element of the novelty of the research. This approach tries to relate that there is a positive correlation between the development of public services and welfare (Rubiwati, 2018). This means that this public service is a prerequisite for achieving the peak of prosperity. This theory is interesting to see and explore cases of special autonomy in Papua. This approach is used because it is very relevant to the conflict in Papua, namely the issue of the deteriorating quality of public services. The novelty of this research, apart from the approach used by the researcher, lies in the issues raised. This year has been a very dilemmatic year for the implementation of special autonomy in Papua. It has been two decades since special autonomy has been implemented, but on one hand, the implementation

of special autonomy in Papua is considered a total failure, because it is unable to respond to various complicated problems in Papua. On the other hand, the government considers that the special autonomy policy in Papua has been successfully implemented. As an alternative way, this research becomes a middle ground to examine the extent to which the implementation of Papua's special autonomy is said to have failed, and to what extent this special autonomy is said to be successful.

Meanwhile, researchers in carrying out the research stages use Creswell's concept. The stages of qualitative research according to Creswell consist of problem identification, literature search, research aims and objectives, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and research reporting. (Raco, 2018). Problem identification in which researchers identify discrepancies between inputs and outputs from the implementation of special autonomy in Aceh. Therefore, this is a research problem that will be raised. Next, the author tries to dig up various relevant previous literature to see how far the research problem has been solved and find something new from this research. Then the author tries to assemble an objective problem formulation based on the facts of the initial data in the field. In this study, the authors collect data through secondary data with literature study and observation as research database data analysis and interpretation was carried out to read the research findings. Finally, the researcher reports the research findings and answers the problem formulations that are set coherently and systematically.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

So far, public services in Papua have not been completed, it can be ascertained that welfare is just an illusion. For example, in the health sector, the extent to which health services can be accessed and enjoyed by Papuans has increased. Especially in the conditions of the Covid-19 pandemic, the health sector is the most visible focus in public service issues. The case of the pandemic indirectly provides a portrait of the capacity of its public services directly how the state of public services in Papua. This means that the support and capacity of human resources and infrastructure in the health sector, for example, is still not sufficient, so in the context in Papua, it can be ascertained that other aspects are also experiencing the same thing. These patterns are very clearly legible through the reality and data in various media and official institutions such as the Central Statistics Agency. In simple terms, for example, in the context of Papua's low human resource development, behind that there is also a low quality of education. The quality of human builders cannot grow well without good quality education. In the health aspect, both in terms of quantity and quality, it is also complex and correlated with one another.

On the achievement of public services, the implications of special autonomy have not provided equal welfare for Papua as balanced with other regions in Indonesia (Prabowo, 2020). Table 1 describes the condition of health service achievement in Papua which has been inscribed through special autonomy.

Based on the achievements of public services in the health sector alone, the reality that is happening in Papua is not proportional to the population of Papua which continues to increase. That's just talking about the problem of the number of doctors and health infrastructure, not to mention their access to health. Therefore, it is necessary to design a special autonomy in Papua that can build the quality of public services not only in the health sector but in other public services.

Welfare in Papua must be built by improving the quality of public services so that this point will indirectly reproduce security development so that it leads to prosperity for Papua itself. This means that in terms of quality and quantity there is a huge disparity when compared to the area of Papua and the total population. Whereas health services are an important part in the context of achieving prosperity for Papua. This is in stark contrast to the disbursement of special autonomy funds for Papua, which in this asymmetrical autonomy policy trajectory is increasing. Therefore, with the increase in the number of special autonomy funds, it should also be followed by an increase in public services that occur in Papua. Both in quality and quantity. If the condition of public services in Papua is still stagnant, is this special autonomy a solution for Papua? Borrowing McGibbon's language sharply, is special autonomy the solution for the separatist movement in Papua? (McGibbon, 2004). The question is reasonable because this special autonomy is a policy that is required to solve all the problems that exist in Papua and every problem that exists between each other is interrelated.

<b>Health workers</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Medical facility</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Medical specialist</b>	251	Hospital	41
<b>General practitioners</b>	774	Public health center	422
<b>Dentist</b>	101	Auxiliary Health Center	1.146
<b>Nurse</b>	5.744	Drugstore	125
<b>Midwife</b>	1.794	Polyclinic	115

Table 1: Health Service Achievements in Papua in 2019  
 Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020 [source]

The increase in special autonomy funds is an implication that the central government continues to provide a stimulus for Papua to rise to build its economic sovereignty. In 2020 the realization of special autonomy funds in Papua decreased due to the Covid-19 pandemic with the realization of funds amounting to 7.56 trillion or a decrease of 9.6%. The decline is certainly understandable considering that it is not too significant, especially since the state's finances are focused on dealing with this pandemic. However, the decline in the special autonomy fund in 2020 does not turn a blind eye to the government's commitment to working on the Papua issue by increasing the special autonomy fund from 2002 to 2019 as shown in table 2.

<b>Years</b>	<b>Special Autonomy Fund (Rp)</b>	<b>Insfrastructure Fund</b>	<b>Total Fund (Rp)</b>
<b>2002</b>	1.382.300.000.000,00	-	1.382.300.000.000,00
<b>2003</b>	1.539.560.000.000,00	-	1.539.560.000.000,00
<b>2004</b>	1.642.617.943.000,00	-	1.642.617.943.000,00
<b>2005</b>	1.775.312.000.000,00	-	1.775.312.000.000,00
<b>2006</b>	2.913.284.000.000,00	536.374.689.000,00	3.449.658.689.000,00
<b>2007</b>	3.295.748.000.000,00	750.000.000.000,00	4.045.748.000.000,00
<b>2008</b>	3.590.142.897.000,00	330.000.000.000,00	3.920.142.897.000,00
<b>2009</b>	2.609.796.098.000,00	1.470.000.000.000,00	4.079.796.098.000,00

<b>2010</b>	2.694.864.788.000,00	800.000.000.000,00	3.494.864.788.000,00
<b>2011</b>	3.157.459.547.550,00	800.000.000.000,00	3.957.459.547.550,00
<b>2012</b>	3.833.402.135.000,00	571.428.571.000,00	4.404.830.706.000,00
<b>2013</b>	4.335.950.048.000,00	571.428.572.000,00	6.777.070.975.000,00
<b>2014</b>	4.777.070.975.000,00	2.000.000.000.000,00	7.190.429.880.000,00
<b>2015</b>	4.940.429.880.000,00	2.250.000.000.000,00	5.595.051.859.400,00
<b>2016</b>	5.395.051.859.400,00	1.200.000.000.000,00	8.240.816.931.000,00
<b>2017</b>	5.615.816.931.000,00	2.625.000.000.000,00	8.240.816.931.000,00
<b>2018</b>	5.580.152.407.000,00	2.400.000.000.000,00	7.980.152.407.000,00
<b>2019</b>	5.808.230.158.000,00	2.824.446.537.000,00	8.632.676.695.000,00
<b>Total</b>	67.029.220.952.400,00	17.163.732.252.000,00	84.192.950.205.400,00

Table 2: Amount of Special Autonomy Fund for Papua Province 2002-2019  
 bpkad.papua.go.id [source]

The commitment of the Central Government in managing the relationship between the centre and the regions within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia is seen in the granting of a special autonomy statute for Papua. This commitment is shown by the disbursement of special autonomy funds which is increasing every year. Through this process, the Central Government wants to reduce all gaps in Papua so that it can be equal to other provinces (Tauda, 2018). In this context, there is a transformation that will be realized by the Central Government for the welfare of the Papuan people. This is the essence of Papua's status as a sovereign territory with special autonomy. The question that then arises again is why do sources of insecurity in everyday life such as health and education services which are mostly centred in cities or settlements dominated by migrants in the Papuan context still occur today? (Pamungkas, 2020). In rationality, in the two decades of implementing special autonomy, of course, there is a budget allocation that is intended for basic services for Papua, namely through improving public services. Health and education, for example, which is better in the context of Papua, must be prioritized.

<b>No</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Poverty level (Percent)</b>
<b>1</b>	2020	26.64
<b>2</b>	2019	26.55
<b>3</b>	2018	27.74
<b>4</b>	2017	27.76
<b>5</b>	2016	28.54
<b>6</b>	2015	28.17
<b>7</b>	2014	27.80
<b>8</b>	2013	31.52
<b>9</b>	2012	30.66
<b>10</b>	2011	34.11
<b>11</b>	2010	34.10

12	2009	34.77
13	2008	35.53
14	2007	40.78
15	2006	41.52
16	2005	40.83
17	2004	38.69
18	2003	39.02
19	2002	41.80

Table 3: Papua's Poverty Level along the Special Autonomy trajectory  
 Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020 [source]

The BPS data instead places Papua as the province with the highest poverty rate in Indonesia. The second position is occupied by the Province of West Papua which bloomed in 2003 from Papua. This means that the division of the region by granting each special autonomy status supported by the disbursement of special autonomy funds does not at all provide significant changes to welfare in Papua. This means that government policies are not mature enough to be decided so the calculations in the field are increasingly complicated for the welfare of Papua. Not to mention the growing financial burden on the State but not followed by welfare in Papua. Papua will always be associated with violence, ignorance, nudity, poverty, backwardness, and isolation (Pigai, 2014). This is certainly understandable because the effect of the special autonomy status is not very encouraging. The next issue that comes to the surface is where does the disbursement of funds go? What about the fund monitoring system? Why do two decades of special autonomy trajectory still place Papua as the region with the highest percentage of poverty? Through these questions, it is certainly not wrong if various parties accuse that this special autonomy has failed to be implemented. Failed in the sense of solving the problem of poverty experienced by the people of Papua. Whereas this poverty will be intertwined with health, education, economy, and others. This means that in reality, the welfare in Papua is still turbulent, plus the issue of public services which to this day has not been realized per the expectations of the Papuan people.

The basis of the special autonomy policy departs from the fact that the form of inequality and inequality in various sectors in Papua. This inequality can be seen in poor public services, poor infrastructure networks, to the problem of the low quality of human resources (HR) (Pratama, 2015). Therefore, a thorough evaluation of the implementation of Law No. 1 of 2001 concerning Papua's special autonomy should be carried out. The reason is that Papua has been implementing this policy for a long time and the results are still far from what was expected. The government needs to find the right format for welfare issues in Papua. As stated earlier, the Papuan problems in various fields are strongly interrelated. Therefore, the high percentage of poverty carried by Papua affects the human development index. This means that the human development index cannot be high if the percentage of poverty is large. This of course will be directly proportional.

Year	Human Development Index
2020	60.44
2019	60.84
2018	60.06
2017	59.09
2016	58.05



2015	57.25
2014	56.75
2013	56.25
2012	55.55
2011	55.01
2010	54.45

Table 4: Human Development Index in Papua's special autonomy interval  
Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020 [source]

The data shows that the HDI in Papua Province is still low when compared to other regions. The number 60 is included in the low classification. Therefore, an important lesson for the implementation of special autonomy is to ensure that the policy can unravel the roots of prosperity in Papua. In today's context, the government needs to evaluate the disbursement of funds in a two-decade trajectory and even conduct a strict audit of why the condition of Papua has not undergone a better transformation. The disbursement of funds that increases every year through special autonomy fund schemes, infrastructure funds, natural resource revenue-sharing funds, and other government transfers of income should certainly be able to unravel the roots of the current prosperity.

The low human development index in Papua shows that from an educational perspective there is a tendency that this policy has no significance in changing education in Papua for the better. This is considering that the quality of a good human will be greatly influenced by the education conditions of the community. This then strengthens the findings from Cahyaningsih and Fitriady that fiscal decentralization that occurred in Papua hurts the education and health sectors (Cahyaningsih & Fitriady, 2019). These two factors, in a very significant proportion, contribute to the low quality of the human development index in Papua. Whereas previously Cahyaningsih and Fitriady confirmed that fiscal decentralization outside Papua tends to have a positive impact on the education and health systems. Therefore, this fiscal capacity which is then embedded in the regulation of special autonomy in Papua has not yet had a significant impact in building the quality of its human resources.

## CONCLUSION

Based on this research, it can be concluded that the main conclusion is that the journey of special autonomy that has been passed for two decades for Papua does not seem to show any signs of approaching the point and spectrum of welfare. This is caused by the factor of public services in Papua in various sectors that have not been touched evenly and widely. Whereas conceptually, welfare in Papua will be realized if the public service sector has also been running well. In terms of quality and quantity, aspects of public services in Papua are still limited. In fact, through the asymmetric fiscal decentralization scheme, which was later called special autonomy, Papua should be able to stabilize itself and be able to catch up with all the lagging that has occurred so far. Therefore, this welfare is a challenge that must be faced how aspects of public services as one of the prerequisites for achieving that goal can be realized. Even in the context of receiving special autonomy status such as DI. Yogyakarta and DKI Jakarta are quite successful, but in the context of Papua, West Papua, and Aceh, there are similar cases where there is a tendency that welfare issues are contributed significantly by aspects of the development of public services. Therefore,

through the results of this study, the main recommendation is that stakeholders in managing central and regional relations, especially through this special autonomy scheme, must be reviewed and ensured that this scheme through its various derivatives must be more responsive, adaptive, and with careful planning that the development of public services in Papua must be boosted to be able to accelerate progress as in other regions that are better and of higher quality to build prosperity.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all the lecturers at the Department of Governmental Politics, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada who have been extraordinary in providing understanding regarding special autonomy so that this paper can be made. I also thank my friends at the 2020 Master's in Government Politics at Gadjah Mada University in various cross-concentrations who have fostered a climate of study and research for us so that this article can be completed. I would also like to thank my friends who concentrate on local politics in particular who are serious about exploring the dynamics of special autonomy and regional government, so this has become the capital in writing this article. Hopefully, this article will be able to contribute to the future of Papua's special autonomy policy for the sake of prosperity in the future.

## REFERENCES

- Achmady, L. (2020). "Kekhususan" Otonomi Khusus Papua. *Jurnal Dinamis*, 17(1), 81.
- Auty, R. M. (2005). Resource Abundance and Economic Development. *Resource Abundance and Economic Development*, 1–340. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0199275785.001.0001>
- Aziz, N. L. L., & Eng, M. (2019). Membangun Identitas Nasional Dalam Perspektif Desentralisasi Dan Otonomi Daerah. *Masyarakat Indonesia*, 45(1), 47–61. <http://jmi.ipk.lipi.go.id/index.php/jmiipk/article/view/884>
- Bertrand, J. (2019). Indonesia: 'Special autonomy' for Aceh and Papua. *Forum of Federation The Global Network on Federalism and Devolved Governance, Occasional*. [www.forumfed.org](http://www.forumfed.org)
- Billon, P. Le. (2001). The political ecology of war: natural resources and armed conflicts. *Political Geography* 20 (2001) 561–584, 6298(March). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298\(01\)00015-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(01)00015-4)
- Cahyaningsih, A., & Fitriady, A. (2019). The Impact of Asymmetric Fiscal Decentralization on Education and Health Outcomes: Evidence from Papua Province, Indonesia. *Recent Issues in Economic Development*, 12(22), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2019/12-2/3>
- Gelb, A. (1989). *Oil Windfalls: Blessing or Curse*. Oxford University Press. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/536401468771314677/pdf/296570paper.pdf>
- Kambu, Y. (2019). Kehadiran Negara melalui Otonomi Khusus di Papu: Studi Kasus Dampak Otsus Pada Ekonomi Orang Asli Papua). *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), 1689–1699.
- Marit, E. L., & Warami, H. (2018). Wacana "Papua Tanah Damai" Dalam Bingkai Otonomi Khusus Papua. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial FISIP Universitas Cenderawasih*, 16(1), 41–46.
- McGibbon, R. (2004). Secessionist Challenges in Aceh and Papua: Is Special Autonomy the Solution? In *Policy Studies No. 10*. <https://www.eastwestcenter.org/publications/secessionist-challenges-aceh-and-papua-special-autonomy-solution>
- Mehlum, H., Moene, K., & Torvik, R. (2005). *CURSED BY RESOURCES OR INSTITUTIONS? Halvor Mehlum Karl Moene Department of Economics*. 10.
- Pamungkas, C. (2020). Menelusuri Akar Konflik dan Kebijakan Damai di Tanah Papua. *Antropologi Indonesia*, 40(2), 100–122. <https://doi.org/10.7454/ai.v40i2.12217>
- Permatasari, A. (2014). Otonomi Khusus Daerah Perbatasan, Alternatif Solusi Penyelesaian Masalah Perbatasan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 21(2), 226–240.
- Pigai, N. (2014). SOLUSI DAMAI DI TANAH PAPUA (MENGUBUR TRAGEDI HAM DAN MENCARI JALAN KEDAMAIAN) 1 Natalius Pigai 2. *Solusi Damai Di Tanah Papua (Mengubur Tragedi HAM Dan Mencari Jalan Kedamaian)*, 11(september 2013), 23–38.

- <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/72813-ID-solusi-damai-di-tanah-papua-mengubur-tra.pdf>
- Prabowo, A. P. (2020). The Implementation of the Special Autonomy of Papua. *Jurnal Pertahanan*, 6(1), 59–74.
- Pratama, A. Y. (2015). Pelaksanaan Desentralisasi Asimetris Dalam Tata Kelola Pemerintahan Daerah Di Era Demokrasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 10(1), 6–14. <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jppk/article/view/5434/2019>
- Raco, J. (2018). *Metode penelitian kualitatif: jenis, karakteristik dan keunggulannya*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/mfzuj>
- Resosudarmo, B. P., Mollet, J. A., Raya, U. R., & Kaiwai, H. (2014). Development in Papua after special autonomy. *Regional Dynamics in a Decentralized Indonesia*, 433–459. <https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814519175-025>
- Rubiwati, E. (2018). Papua dalam Media: Analisa Framing Pemberitaan Otonomi Khusus di Papua Barat. *Jurnal Masyarakat & Budaya*, 20(3), 375–390.
- S, R., & Saleh, K. (2017). Hubungan Pemerintah Pusat dan Daerah dalam Otonomi Khusus di Provinsi Papua Barat. *Jurnal Politik Universitas Nasional*, 13(1), 1903–1919.
- Tabuni, D., Rumapea, P., & Areros, W. (2016). Implementasi Kebijakan Otonomi Khusus (Studi Kasus Tentang Pelayanan Publik Bidang Pendidikan) Di Kabupaten Lanny Jaya Provinsi Papua. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik UNSRAT*, 1(043), 163229.
- Tadjoeddin, M. Z. (2007). A future resource curse in Indonesia: The political economy of natural resources, conflict and development. *CRISE Working Paper, November 2007*, 1–43.
- Tauda, G. A. (2018). Desain Desentralisasi Asimetris Dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan Republik Indonesia. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 1(4), 413–435. <https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v1i4.413-435>