Scrutinizing Papua from Nationalism, Identity Politics, and Indonesian National Integration Perspectives

Ari Setiarsih Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Suharno Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract
This study explores theoretically the problems of Papua in the perspective of nationalism, identity politics, and national integration of Indonesia. In the context of Papua, the problems of nationalism and integration is a sensitive issue both historically and realistically. This creates a dilemmatic situation to understanding the Papuan nationalism. This article used descriptive qualitative approach with library research. The sources of data are paper that consist books, scientific journals, and mass media which gathered through documentation techniques and discourse identification. While the data analysis techniques used content analysis techniques. This study shows that: first, the emergence of aspirations about Papuan justice and independence is an attempt to maintain the autonomy, identity, and unity of Papuans, so that nationalism is a sentiment and a movement. The construction of Papuan nationalism tends to be oriented towards the ethnocultural nationalism that constructed as identity politics, so that the development of Papuan identity leads to the construction of a resistant identity. Therefore, nationalism needs to be constructed through nation-building efforts. Second, political reasoning to affirm the integration of Papua and NKRI includes: (1) building a catalyst for conflict and intensive communication; (2) implementing the politics of recognition; (3) accelerated development based on local understanding and identity of indigenous Papuans; (4) changing the way the state views the Indonesian nationalism in Papua; (5) establishing the control of violence through strengthening the role of civil society.

Keywords:
Identity Politics; Nationalism; National Integration; Papua

INTRODUCTION

It is already 55 years since Papua

Ari Setiarsih is a gaduated student at department of Law and Civics Education-Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interest about conflict and resolution in Papua. (arisetiarsih@gmail.com)
Suharno is a lecturer and researcher at department of Law and Civics Education-Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia. His research interest about conflict and resolution in Indonesia. (suharno@uny.ac.id)
This paper based on Ari's master thesis at the department under supervision of Suharno. The previous version of this paper has been presented in International Symposium on Indonesian Politics in Universitas Negeri Semarang-Indonesia April 2018. We would like to thank to participants of the symposium for the comments, and anonymous reviewers for their inputs.

have become an integral part of Republic of Indonesia, however, the Papua is still an issue nationally and internationally. Eversince Papua integration into Republic of Indonesia on May 1, 1963, numerous issues such as violence, development, prosperity are the most common conflict trigger in Papua. The research result of Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) mentioned that Papua conflict are sourced from four strategic issues namely Papua integration to Republic of Indonesia

historyand Papuan people political identity, political violence andhuman rightss violation, development failure in Papua and Government's inconsistency in implementing special autonomy, and marginalization of indigenous Papuan people (Widjojo, et.al., 2009).

Of four mentioned conflict sources, the main source of conflict in Papua is the integration history of Papua into the Republic of Indonesia. The Papuan nationalists consider Papua integration into Republic of Indonesia is the obstacle for Papuan independence since from the perspective of Papuan nationalist, West Papua State has been existing and has been declared on December 1, 1961. Besides, Papua integration process in 1963 is perceived to be problematic because it did not involve the indigenous Papuan people but just a mere political conflict between Indonesia and Dutch that excluded Papuan from the conflict. The procedure political status determination through People Referendum 1969 was considered not reflecting the Papuan aspiration because the process was deemed unfair and was only represented by 1,025 Papuan people representative instead of the whole Papuan people (Widjojo, et.al., 2009).

Papua integration issue created many aspirations and movements that demand for independence since 1964 until today. Political movement and military armed resistance flourish amongst the people under the notion of the leaders and supporters of Papua Merdeka (Papua Independent) that regional integration of Papua into Republic of Indonesia is problematic (Widjojo & Budiatri, 2012). The Papuan nationalists consider Papua integration into Republic of Indonesia as obstruction for Papua independence because from the Papua nationalist perspective, West Papua State already exists and was declared on December 1, 1961. Besides, West Papua integration process is perceived as disputable because it did not involve Papuan but only a political contestation between Indonesia and the Dutch without Papuan people. By this reason, the movement to fight for independence has been growing strong in Papua.

The emergence of aspiration for Papua independence is identifiable from the survey result by an international institution in 2002 that in 12 regency in Papua with the sample number was almost reaching 2,000 people. It showed the majority of indigenous Papuan (75% of the Papuan people sample group that

comprised 60% of total sample) realized the existence of aspiration for Papua independence and believed that independence will materialize (Muttaqin, 2013). Such aspiration is inherited through generation to generation. This condition leads to numerous massive political movements and armed movements that play the role as main supporter for Papua independence. The existence of these groups has strategic bargaining position although their position, both locally and nationally, tends to be marginal. In contrast, their position in international stage has relatively high bargaining power against Indonesian government (Elisabeth, 2006). Therefore, political issue and free Papua group effort are getting widespread within the Papua people.

Based on the description above, it is conclusive that there is a stark paradigm difference in interpreting Papua integration into Republic of Indonesia history between the Papua nationalist and Indonesia nationalist. There are several issues namely, independence aspiration, belief of Papuan people that independence will materialize one day, the emergence of massive political and armed movements, and increasing bargaining position of such groups that

attracts sympathy and support from international organization. Those issues reflect that complex problems are occurring in Papua with independence as the central concern. From the state perspective, such effort is regarded as people resistance against the state that can cause nation disintegration. This definitely contradicts the ideology essence that put loyalty and individual allegiance at the highest level for the sake of the nation and the state, as Kohn (1965) called as nationalism.

Nationalism terminology closely related to national consciousness by which different groups from various identities could feel themselves as a unity (Irianto, 2013). Consequently, nationalism plays important role in protecting and increasing strong feeling on national identity, to defend national unity, and nation-ness for national interest, and to defend territorial authority during the nation development (Li and Hong, 2017). Hence, nationalism and national integration are two interrelated terminologies.

On Indonesia nation-state context, nationalism is a necessity to defend Indonesia national integrity. Nationalism is not only serving as the prerequisite at the early stage of integration but also to

reach the highest level of national goal which are nation unity and oneness. Therefore, based on those issues, the writer intended to describe Papua issue from nationalism, identity politics, national integration perspective, and aimed to produce proper political reasoning in analyzing Papua conflict. Several questions to answer in this paper are; how is Papua viewed from nationalism, identity politics, and national integration perspective? How is political reasoning of Papua reintegration from the nationalism, identity politics, and integration national?

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES
Research Method

The method for this article was qualitative descriptive research method with library research approach. Resources for this article were papers, of which provide signs that comprised of letters, numbers, pictures, and other kind of symbols. Type of papers used for this article were books, scientific journals, and mass media that were compiled through documentation technique and discourse identification. Meanwhile, data analysis technique used content analysis that consisted of research design, primary data

inquiry, and contextual knowledge inquiry.

This article contributes to political science development especially on nationalism theme. From the state perspective, nationalism is often regarded as the embodiment of positive behavior that refers to loyalty, devotion, love, and commitment to the nation and the state. Meanwhile, the emergence of resistance movement that based on ethnic identity in Papua also indicates another kind of nationalism i.e., ethnic nationalism. This phenomenon reveals that nationalism has a very broad meaning. Research over previous studies showed that there is no research nor article that examine Papua from the nationalism, identity politics, and national integration politics. Thus, this article provides a more comprehensive information.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Nationalism

Smith (2003) argued that nationalism is an ideology that put nation as the central theme and try to assert its existence to reach and to defend autonomy, unity, and national identity. From this definition, nationalism comprises two elements namely nationalism as an ideology and

nationalism as political movement (Evera, 1995). Irish nationalism conceptualization is one of examples of nationalism that drives political autonomy, national identity development, and nation building (Kane, 2011).

Meanwhile Gellner (1983) defined nationalism as political legitimation principle that requires harmony of each national units and political units. Within this context, nationalism can be understood from two perspectives; nationalism as sentiment and nationalism as movement. First, nationalism as sentiment shows nationalism is an emotion both as anger due to certain violation and as satisfaction as one's needs are fulfilled. Second, nationalism as a movement displays nationalism as a result, response, or actualization on surfacing feelings and sentiments so those would materialize into a movement.

Santiago (2012) said that within Gellner perspective, nation and nationalism is claimed to be as a modern invention that does not originate from historiography but rather a vast, philosophical, and based on humanity development perspective agreed conclusion. Nationalism is a logical conclusion in humanity stage where industrial society is dominating. This has

function as exclusive social cohesion in the modern time. Anderson (2001) proposed another perspective, nationalism is an idea on imagined community because each member of a nation does not personally know every member of his/her nation. Nationalism lives on from the imagination on community that is present at all times inside every nation member's mind that acts as social identity reference. Anderson's constructivist perspective is interesting since nationalism is interpreted as collective imagination in building border between "us" and "them". A culturally constructed border through capitalism imprint, not only a mere ideological fabrication of dominant group. Eventually, a nation is not only imagined as a community because the consolidated groups within the imagined community also already have had their own respective nationalism far before the new nation is formed.

Several approaches are useful to understand nationalism depends on the needs and condition. There are three approaches to understand nationalism; primordial, situational, and constructivist (Brown, 2006). Thananithichot (2011) study result in Thailand showed that primordialist, instrumentalist, or constructivist have material

consequences. Thailand identity construction is indeed a unique identity since it consists of King's important role and the royal family as the political entrepreneurs. Therefore, the political entrepreneur mechanism is the most appropriate approach in explaining nationalism and ethnic conflict in Thailand politics. However, different from Thailand context, Kaufmann (2016) study result showed nationalism classical theories, both modernism and ethnosymbolic theory, always emphasize the role of the elites and national consciousness spread from the elites to the mass groups, and from the central territory to its periphery region. Hence, complexity theory arises that explains the national identity from within the society.

Besides, nationalism is also important to analyze from poststructuralism and postcolonialism perspective. Poststructuralism sees every human being should have equal potentials and rights so that nationalism could emerge to deconstruct hierarchical process that is considered does not give equal treatments and rights (Suastika, 2012). Meanwhile, postcolonialism is utilized to cope with race, gender, justice, and other social problems (Slemon, 2001). In South Korea on anti-colonialism discourse showed that

Japan colonialism encroaches into internal Korea border so it rearticulates the meaning and perception of the people on belonging and feeling of a part of a nation (Kang, 2016).

Identity Politics: A Struggle Movement

Identity politics is a result of identity construction dynamics. Identity is a never complete creation process, it is always in process, not instantly formed, not necessarily reflecting the existing condition but rather as a representation of driving force that transforms an individual into a new subject by which a new discourse sphere can be found (Hall, 1990). Identity is also never be a static location since identity is containing trails of the past and today identity (Rutherford, 1990). Therefore, identity is situational that is adaptable to social situation. Overall, identity is a product of social construction that cannot survive outside cultural representation (Barker, 2000). Eventually, identity is expressible through any kinds of representation, both personal and social.

Castells (2010) explained that identity social construction will always happen in the context related to power relation, therefore there are three identity construction forms; legitimation identity,

resistant identity, and project identity. First, legitimation identity is identity construction by dominant institution in the society with the goal is to widen and rationalize its domination onto social actor. Second, resistant identity is identity construction produced by oppressed, devaluated, stigmatized actors by the dominating groups. Third, project identity is identity that emerges when social actor is building new identity with available matter and culture to transform his/her position within the society and also to transform the society's social structure as a whole.

In another context, the correlation between identity and politics in term of studying policy and its discourse in policymaking debate makes ideational approach is more relevant to analyze the correlation between identity and public policy (Beland, 2016; Buchari, 2014; Bliss, 2013; Alfaqi, 2015). Identity also can be utilized in political struggle of an ethnic to reach certain objective caused by factors that considered as oppression or political injustice. This can be called as identity politics that usually rooted in attached stereotype using primordialism perspective so that matter is always colored by conflict. Identity politics can be observed when there is tension between

the superior versus the inferior, the majority versus the minority, and its power is recognizable when the minority existence is started to get recognition and be fought for through systemic assimilation or acculturation. The struggle will end when group's identity and existence earn equal position and rights in social, culture, and politics (Buchari, 2014). Until recently, the traditional form of identity politics has been preserved although it takes other new methods (Bliss, 2013). Consequently, it is not uncommon if similarity in characteristic, ethnic, and tribe can cause the emergence of fighting tool for a group to defend their hope (Alafaqi, 2015).

Building National Integration

Banton (2010) said national integration is interactive process where majority behavior and minority behavior are both equally important. Birch (2012) added that national integration is a national historical community unification process that is different in its essence from historical community integration on regional or international level. Therefore, national integration is a process of unifying different communities on national scale to reach common objective.

To build integration, several forces are must be consolidated. According to Birch (2012), the power to build integration is political control consolidation in a region, political penetration, educational system that teaches belonging on national identity and history that directly or not directly will plant patriotism an national pride. Meanwhile, Irianto (2013) argued that integration can materialized when a supportive identity exists for various groups unified by ideological, economical, and social common issue. Besides, integration also requires supporting component such as social mobilization (unplanned) and government policy to maintain behavior and loyalty of the citizen.

By developing national institution and tactic exploitation from the political socialization process, the effort to alter local loyalty and fragmented loyalty with national loyalty that is stronger is called nation building (Birch, 2012). Nation building is national identity building process where the citizens share emotion based on common grounds, objective, and preference to reach unity so that the state will be stable and formidable on the long term (Li and Hong, 2017). Study result by Baba (2011) showed the only nation building strategy that is applicable on India's diverse community is to provide something that all people can equally have belonging to, respect, and security. However, there is no consensus on special autonomy as a nation building strategy.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Papua in Nationalism, Identity Politics, and Indonesia National Integration Perspective

Chauvel (2005) study mentioned that Papua conflict happened because there was disappointment when Papua soil was becoming Indonesia territory, the power contestation between indigenous Papuan elites with non-Papuan officers who had been dominating since Dutch colonialism era, different economic development and government on Papuan soil, marginalization of indigenous Papuan people due to the coming of outsiders. Meanwhile, according to LIPI analysis (Widjojo et al, 2009), the cause of Papua conflict is contrast difference between Indonesian nationalism construction compared to Papuan nationalism construction. For the Indonesia nationalist, Papua is an integral part of Indonesia so that the nationalism construction is Indonesia-ness. While for the Papua nationalist, they base their

nationalism on the difference between Melanesian race and Malayan race. From Papua nationalist view, the result of 1969 Referendum was rigged by Indonesia state so it did not reflect the Papuan people representative political aspiration. Consequently, the ideological hatred sentiment over Indonesian government has been planted from generation to generation.

According to LIPI (Widjojo et al., 2009), Indonesian nationalism building through militaristic approach have had its impact on defending the Republic of Indonesia integrity parallel to fight real and armed enemies. The consequence is that any action that is not inline with state's position will be sanctioned militaristically through violence approach. Supriatma research result (2013) mentioned Indonesia Military Force (TNI) is the largest security force in West Papua backed by intelligence network. Superficially, the police is still acting as the responsible institution for domestic security. However, TNI is the one holding the majority role in intervening domestic security. More than dealing with security issue, exposed that the military and the local government are the main factors in influencing the news content of mainstream media in Papua (Tapsell,

2015). Consequently, the mass media practitioners are operating within authoritarian subnational environment where press freedom has not been completely enjoyed by local journalists. Thus, the most important issue in military reform is to separate military from politics and business sphere.

On the other aspect, Mambraku (2015) study revealed Indonesian government until today is stil using violence that contradicts with the values of Pancasila and 1945 Indonesia Constitution namely equality, peacefulness, justice, diversity appreciation, minority protection, law enforcement, human rightss protection. Since the New Order, military was the *de facto* state's representation that implies the state's interest is the military's interest. The use of violent instrument through security forces to fight the separatist movement such as Organisasi Papua Merdeka/OPM or Free Papua Movement had brought political violence andhuman rightss violation on Papuan people who voiced their criticism on state's failure in accommodating indigenous Papuan people. Ironically, the political violence andhuman rightss violation could easily get one-sided justification under the pretext of noble

duty of security forces in keeping the Indonesia integrity (Widjojo et al, 2009).

Setara Institute (2016) research mentioned that in 2015 there were 16human rightss violation incidents in Papua and 68 incidents in 2016. Of those incidents, there were 107 human rights violations done by the security forces that fell into two categories; direct violation action (*by commission*), and deliberate negligence (*by omission*). There were three majorhuman rights violation form done by both state actor and non-state actor namely activist criminalization (34 incidents), detaining (33 incidents), torture (12 incidents). Therefore, it is conclusive thathuman rights violation in Papua is still very high.

Based on argumentation above, it is analyzable that the emergence of Papua independence aspiration in form of political and military movement is an effort to defend autonomy, identity, and unity of indigenous Papuan people. Within this context, the effort can be seen from two perspectives namely nationalism as sentiment and nationalism as movement (Gellner, 1983). Nationalism as sentiment is the feeling caused by certain actions, both pleasant and unpleasant. The sentiment in this context is the unsatisfied feeling on the historical

and actual facts in Papua especially on Papua integration to Republic of Indonesia that considered very problematic. Besides, the sentiment also has to do with unsatisfied feeling toward various unjust action, violence, human rights violation suffered by indigenous Papuans. Eventually, the will and effort have been emerging to fight the injustice and oppression in movement to defend right, identity, autonomy, and unity of Papuan. In other word, nationalism emerges when a group of people born within the same territory identify themselves as a community that shares common life history, which usually is an oppression from other nation onto their own nation. Thus, nationalism rises as resistance movement (Hiplunudin, 2017).

In Anderson view, nationalism is an imagination development process from a group on their own community where nationalism is rooted from the cultural system of intergroup who do not know each other. In this context, imagination on unity as a nation become the strength and consciousness that drives a group of people to create a national consciousness and to act according cultural, ethnic, religious, and racial unity for the sake of national integration. The constructed

consciousness in Papuan people mind could make collective consciousness and national spirit based on Indonesia multiculturalism. However, the constructed imagination in the reality is the injustice phenomenon that encourages the birth of resistance consciousness. The historical experience and past trauma do have influence in constructing Papuan people thinking paradigm so that the constructed consciousness and loyalty is more to ethnic group entity instead of larger group entity. To most of Papuan, the imagined community is not very distant from their own community so that Papua could be a part of Indonesian imagined community, however, Indonesia is not a part of imagined community by Papuan. Therefore, the consciousness and loyalty that emerges is directed toward their own ethnic group that eventually generates ethnonationalism.

Argumentation above shows that ethnicity plays a solid and central role in ethnonationalism where identity and ethnic culture from certain group frequently play important role in state building (Kivisto and Croll, 2012). In Papua context, ethnic identity and race sameness also play important role in Papua people consciousness construction.

The rise of various political and military movements show Papuan nationalism is constructed on loyalty and commitment that are more oriented on common objective of the ethnic group. The conclusion is, Papua constructed nationalism is more oriented on ethnocultural nationalism construction instead of citizenship nationalism.

Ethnocultural nationalism is nationalism based on community emotion over belief of common ancestral myth and shared perception that the myth is legitimized by contemporariness, physiognomy, language, or religion sameness. Ethnocultural nationalism is signified as ethnic or cultural nationalism, when a nation is depicted as unified community based on its ethnocultural sameness so that emphasizing on biological family image. Citizenship itself is a nationalism that refers to community emotion based on faith residential place on common homeland, commitment to state and civil society institution, creating diverse national character, and the existence of citizenship culture so that every citizen from the diverse ancestor can have shared objective and interest (Brown, 2006). On Turkey case, Goalwin (2017) said the policy that is perceived as citizenship nationalism or exclusive ethnic

nationalism is actually two examples of border construction process that is designed to create a cohesive national community.

Ethnocultural nationalism has its correlation with post-structural approach. In post-structural approach, Papua people resistance is an attempt to deconstruct state's hierarchical system process that is deemed has yet to give equal treatment and right to Papua people. Rutherford (1990), said identity is never a static location since identity contains pas traces and today's identity so the identity is situational in its nature that also is adaptable in social situation. Identity is a social construction that cannot survive outside the cultural representation (Barker, 2000). Thus, identity will be projected in personal both or social representation. In this dynamic perspective, Papua identity is constructed as a capital to fight against injustice felt by Papuans. Identity is utilized to produce ethnic based nationalism in order to fight for the group's hope to be free from injustice and to gain independence. This corresponds to Castells' (2003) statement that identity is not only limited to how an individual identify him/herself, but also how the dominant group gives claims and internalizes individual or certain group

whom stereotypes are attached to them. This thing confirms that identity is a social construction.

On another context, Papuan resistance in speaking out their aspiration and call for justice is heading to resistance identity construction. In this case, actors who suffer oppression, devaluation, and stigmatized by dominating group construct Papua aspiration identity. Thus, they generate resistance in order to defend Papua people life sustainability (Castells, 2010). The resistance manifests in different identity that takes form in both armed and ideological political resistance against the state. Given the condition, identity construction accommodates different essence with nationalism and national integration spirit, and this condition leads to where identity is politicized and then gives birth to identity politics.

Identity politics is a form of politics that emphasizes on collective group such as minority ethnic, religious group, LGBT, disabled group, working class, as base of their political action to acquire social acknowledgement on their life challenges (Brunila & Rossi, 2017). Identity politics is often signified by collective identity politicization (ethnicity, nationality, religion) to seize power in brutish manner

(Orjuela, 2014). Therefore, it is not uncommon that violence accompanies identity politics. This violence is the main issue in ethnic identity and ethnic mobilization (Verkaaik, 2016). Paudel (2016) study in Nepal showed identity politics is a dominant ideological power and quickly discover its wah for radical political development in Nepal. The political movement is arising in a certain historical conjuncture. Therefore, in this context, violence in Papua is an important factor that causes Papuan identity is politicized as political struggle.

Departing from analysis above, nationalism correlates with national integration where the national consciousness, nationalism, and national identity will lead to resilient national integrity. Murtamadji (2006) said constructing national integration can be done through intensive interaction and communication where social groups are communicating to each other to create communication network within a cohesive social unity while still acknowledge differences among themselves. Meanwhile, to construct integration also requires supporting forces namely political control consolidation at regional level, political penetration, educational system that teaches the students belonging on

national identity and their nation's history that directly or indirectly will plant the patriotism seed, and lastly national pride emotion development (Birch, 2012).

In Papua context, it is identifiable that the flourishing of numerous Papuan groups that are resistant toward Indonesian government marked with resistance movements is an indicator for integration rejection tendency. Birch (2012) said integration process would not be successful when there is ethnic or cultural minority group that rejects integration. The minority ethnic can be integrated into a national community through two ways. First, unplanned way by mobilization and second one is through deliberate decision. Deliberate decision is a recommendation from Edosa study result on Nigeria case. Edosa (2014) gave suggestion that federal states from Nigeria federation must determine minimum requirement in term of citizenship or non-indigenous people acceptance in collective and centralized manner based on mutual respect, equality, and cooperation among diverse ethnic groups and nation constituents. Besides, just and equal treatment is needed, and intended (deliberate) development of unity sentiment of Nigerian people to manifest successful

democratization and national stability come into being.

Guided by both integration ways, in order to strengthen Papua and Indonesia integration, it is needed deliberate decision in form of nation building. This method can be done by fulfilling the integration prerequisites and components and increasing forces needed in integration process namely, regional level political control consolidation, and political penetration. Also, very important, educational system that teaches the students about national history, national identity, national insight, nationalism, patriotism, and national pride building. Blakkisrud & Nozimova (2010) said the educational system creation in nation building is a policy implemented in Tajikistan. After Tajik civil war ended in 1997, Tajik government tried to plant new national consciousness through its education system by teaching its nation's history. Through the government-approved curriculum, the government offered general understanding about the past that was intended to strengthen today's Tajik community.

Based on several analysis above, the conclusion is that previous researches confirm that issues of development, violent actions, human rights violation,

and nationalism construction difference are very complex unsolved problems. To resolve those problems, the authority cannot choose paradigm and solution for Papua problems in binary opposition perspective that contrasting between dominant narration and counter narration but instead it should deconstruct both dominant narrations. Persuasive effort through dialogue between Papua people and the government is the major step as priority to solve the conflict instead of militaristic repressive approach (Widjojo et al, 2009). Thus, persuasive effort through humanity approach can be utilized as resolution alternative.

Political Reason in Strengthening Papua and Republic of Indonesia Integration

Referring to previous discussion, it is important to put political reason in strengthening Papua and Republic of Indonesia integration based on prerequisite fulfillment and national integration strength. Therefore, the writer argues that there are several policies that state should take in the attempt to resolve Papua conflict. *First*, building conflict catalyzer and intensive national dialogue between Indonesian government and Papuan representative. The dialogue should underline moderation, negotiation,

and accommodation principles as conflict resolution means. Indonesian government and Papuan representative must be open and be willing to strive for solution so that Papua shall enjoy peace and prosperity. The solution will be happening if there is mutual understanding and coherent cooperation between Indonesian government and Papuan representative especially those who are resistant against Indonesian government. Hence, intensive national dialogue is an important effort as peaceful and strategic approach to create solution that is acceptable and is considered to be just for both parties.

Second, recognition politics implementation to construct genuine Papua-ness identity so that Indonesia representation is manifesting on Papua identity, and conversely, Papua representation is also manifesting in Indonesia identity. Taylor (1994) argued that the deepest essence of multiculturalism is the struggle for recognition, so within the political sphere the people with minority identity background want to defend their unique identity. On individual level, the identity creation and development of each person will always happen within enduring dialogue and struggle process with other people. At the same time on social level,

the essence of recognition politics is thorough recognition on certain group's way of life as something unique and authentic since the existence and capability of a group to develop is highly dependent from individual recognition or other groups (Wattimena, 2011). On this context, recognition politics could be the ground to realize togetherness among various culture, ethnic, race, and religion. Failure to recognize this variation could lead to social gap that burdens the victim with psychological agony. Thus, this affirmative policy must be based on the institutional spirit and policy that carries two objectives, to eradicate gap and to balance representativeness and also to create a community that highly regard diversity and differences (Widjojo et al, 2009).

Third, Papua development acceleration should be done through economic, social, political, and cultural approach that is responsive to local understanding and indigeneous Papua identity. In the reality, the implementation of special autonomy as an initial step for Papua development does not give significant improvement on poverty, HDI, work force, education, health, and economic empowerment of local Papua people (Widjojo and Budiatri, 2012).

Special autonomy, originally intended by the central government to answer prosperity and justice in Papua, has not been realized as it should be. Bertrand (2014) research result mentioned the special autonomy implementation failure has three causes. First, the law is not a product of negotiation but an imposed solution by the central government. Second, the Papuan people are divided among themselves on so many interests that they have failed to seize the provided opportunity. Third, central government is being undermined by law in its effort to restrain separatist movement that in fact causing the law is not credible.

Besides, the special autonomy's capital centered development paradigm is deemed to be the cause of its failure. This paradigm contradicts with the initial intention of Papua special autonomy granting since it does not put human as the development initiator and objective. The consequence is that development will only reach very few people who are included into the capitalist, political elite, expert, and few working people. The paradigm will also creat dehumanization effect; human will lose his/her soul, initiative, be passive, and be powerless (Munandar, 2008). Karim (2012) study result said that Papua problem could be solved through an approach that responds local understanding about development and modernization that comprises four aspects namely traditional management approach development, development that is unbound to time or target, development on sensitive conflict, and development acceleration. That approach affirms new paradigm in conflict resolution that is through development approach with focus on decision management structure that is credible to indigenous Papua people. The formal structure development aims to support traditional structure so the traditional decision-making and justice system can be the main target in future development.

Fourth, state's perspective shift in perceiving Indonesian nationalism in Papua because Papua has different seeding nationalism compared to other Indonesia regions. It is dangerous if national consciousness is seen as an identical in every Indonesia region in order to generalize Indonesian nationalism because in fact the Papua history shows different seeding Indonesian nationalism process (Meteray; 2012). Indonesian nationalism seeding cannot internalize in militaristic, repressive, and discriminative way but rather it would be much more proper if the approach is humanistic and

in harmony with the historical aspect. Papuan nationalism generalization cannot be justified physically and symbolically but it should be historically and integratively studied. We cannot claim that Papua society does not have Indonesia-ness nationalism although they live in a stronger Papuan nationalism reality. Construction of national consciousness, nationalism spirit, to live together willingness are not only constructed from political and economic power, or even the call of the elites. More than that, nationalism should be constructed as high consciousness, loyalty, and love towards larger group entity than ethnicity group entity.

Fifth, creating violence control through civil society empowerment to get involved in deliberative democracy andhuman rights violence prevention as an effort to improve democracy inclusiveness degree in Papua. Civil society is society that can independently act from the state and market to promote various interests in the society that enables citizens to perform collectively in public sphere (Jaysawal, 2013). The condition is the base for deliberative democracy construction as inclusive democracy system that emphasizes the importance of social democracy and more

participative democracy conception. The state needs to observe the importance of social freedom so the citizen shall have the relatively equal power and opportunity to fully participate in civil society life (Vincent, 2010).

In deliberative democracy model, the justice issue will intensify since there is minority group involvement in decision making that is based on conference for consensus that is believed enable space and openness. Therefore, to construct inclusive democracy system the government should give broader access to minority to voice their aspirations in decision making. Besides, civil society should also take part in preventing and resolvinghuman rights violation through humanitarian approach. The role of civil society organization, non-government organization, cultural institution, cultural and religious leader, and other groups in the society must be empowered by involving their aspiration and participation in public sphere to create a better "New Papua".

CONCLUSION

Based on the description above, this article's conclusion is the rise of aspiration for justice and independence for Papua in form of political and military movement is

an effort to defend Papuan's autonomy, identity, and unity. The movement can be seen from two perspectives. First, nationalism as sentiment that shows anger and dissatisfaction over historical fact and injustice suffered by Papuan people. Second, nationalism as movement shows anger and dissatisfaction response that creates intention and effort to hold resistance. In this context, ethnicity plays a very important role in constructing Papuan people's consciousness, loyalty, and love on their own ethnic group. The effect is Papuan nationalism tends to be oriented on construction of ethnocultural nationalism that eventually constructed as identity politics, i.e. a tool to resist over injustice, which makes Papuan people identity leads to resistant identity construction. Therefore, nationalism should be constructed as an ideology that emphasizes consciousness and loyalty to nation and states entity through nation building. It is done through fulfillment of prerequisites and integration components and also to improve required forces needed in integration process namely; regional political control consolidation, political penetration, and educational system that teaches the students about national history, national identity, national insight, nationalism, patriotism, and national pride development.

Based on discussion above, there are several political reasons that state can do to strengthen Papua and Republic of Indonesia integration, which are: (1). To create conflict catalyzer and intensive communication through national dialogue between Republic of Indonesia government and Papua representative; (2). Implementing recognition politics to construct genuine Papua-ness identity so that Indonesia representation can be seen on Papua identity and Papua representation also can be seen in Indonesia identity; (3). Papua development acceleration through economic, social, political, and cultural approach that responds to local understanding and indigenous Papua people identity; (4). State's perspective shift in perceiving Indonesian nationalism in Papua since Papua has different nationalism seeding; (5). Creating violence management through civil society empowerment to get involved in deliberative democracy process andhuman rights violation prevention as an effort to improve democracy inclusiveness degree in Papua.

REFERENCES

Alfaqi, M.Z. (2015). Memahami Indonesia melalui perspektif nasionalisme, politik identitas, serta solidaritas. *Jurnal Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 28 (2): 111-116.

Anderson, B. (2001). *Imagined communities: komunitas-komunitas terbayang*. (Terjemahan Omi Intan Naomi). Yogyakarta: INSIST. (Edisi asli diterbitkan tahun 1991 oleh Verso).

Baba, N.A. (2011). Federalism and the Indian experience with nation building: an appraisal. *South Asian Survey*. 18 (1): 109–120.

Banton, M. (2010). National integration in France and Britain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 27 (1): 151-168.

Barker, C. (2000). *Cultural studies theory and practice*: London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Beland, D. (2016). Identity, politics, and public policy. *Critical Policy Studies*. 1-18.

Bertrand, J. (2014). Autonomy and stability: the perils of implementation and "divide-and-rule" tactics in Papua, Indonesia. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 20 (2): 174-199.

Birch, A.H. (2012). *Nationalism and national integration*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Blakkisrud, H. & Nozimova, S. (2010). History writing and nation building in post-independence Tajikistan. *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*. 38 (2): 173-189.

Bliss, C. (2013). The marketization of identity politics. *Sociology*. 47 (5): 1011–1025.

Brown, D. (2006). *Contemporary nationalism civic, ethnocultural, and multicultural politics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Brunila, K. & Rossi, L.M. (2017). Identity politics, the ethos of vulnerability, and education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 1-12.

Buchari, S.A. (2014). *Kebangkitan etnis menuju politik identitas*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Castells, M. (2003). *The power of identity: the information age, economy, society and culture Vol II*. Australia: Blacwell Publishing.

Castells, M. (2010). *The power of identity (2nd ed)*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Chauvel, R. (2005). *Constructing Papuan nationalism: history, ethnicity and adaptation*. New York: East-West Center Washington.

Edosa, E. (2014). National integration, citizenship, political participation and democratic stability in Nigeria. *An International Journal Of Arts And Humanities*. 3 (3): 61-82.

Elisabeth, A. (2006). *Dimensi internasional kasus Papua*. Jurnal Penelitian Politik. 3 (1): 43-65.

Evera, S.V. (1995). *Hypotheses on nationalism and the causes of war*. Dalam Charles Kupchan, Nationalism and nationalities in the New Europe. New York: Cornell University Press.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Goalwin, G.J. (2017). Understanding the exclusionary politics of early Turkish nationalism: an ethnic boundary-making approach. *Nationalities Papers*. 1-17.

Hall, S. (1990). *Cultural identity and diaspora*. Dalam Jonathan Rutherford, A place called home: identity and the cultural politics of difference. London: Lawrence & Wishart Limited.

Hiplunudin, A. (2017). *Politik identitas di Indonesia: dari zaman kolonialis Belanda hingga reformasi*. Yogyakarta: Calpulis.

Irianto, A.M. (2013). Integrasi nasional sebagai penangkal etnosentrisme di Indonesia. *HUMANIKA*, 18 (02): 1-9.

Jaysawal, N. (2013). Civil society, democratic space, and social work. *SAGE Open*, 1-12.

Kane, A. (2011). *Constructing Irish national identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kang, J.Y. (2016). *The dynamics of nation, state and people*. Interventions. 18 (3): 379-403.

Karim, D.B. (2012). Whose development? the need for conflict-sensitive development in Papua, Indonesia. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 7 (1): 95-100.

Kaufmann, E. (2016). Complexity and nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*: 1–20.

Kivisto, P. & Croll, P. (2012). *Race and ethnicity: the basics*. USA & Canada: Routledge.

Kohn, H. (1965). *Nationalism: its meaning and history*. New York: D. Van Nostrad Compay, Inc.

Li, L. & Hong, F. (2017). *The national games and national identity in China: a history*. New York: Routledge.

Mambraku, N.S.T. (2015). Penyelesaian konflik di tanah Papua dalam perspektif politik Papua *conflict resolution from political perspective*. *Kajian*, 20 (2): 75-85.

Meteray, B. (2012). *Nasionalisme ganda orang Papua*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

Munandar, A. (2008). Peran negara dalam penguatan program pemberdayaan masyarakat. *Jurnal Poelitik*, 4 (1): 151-162.

Murtamadji. (2006). Konflik dan tindak kekerasan di era pasca orde baru dan upaya menumbuhkan integrasi nasional di Indonesia. *Humanika*, 6 (1): 95-105.

Muttaqin, A. (2013). Otonomi khusus Papua sebuah upaya merespon konflik dan aspirasi kemerdekaan Papua. *Politika*, 4 (1): 5-18.

Orjuela, C. (2014). Corruption and identity politics in divided societies. *Third World Quarterly*. 35 (5): 753-769.

Paudel, D. (2016). Ethnic identity politics in Nepal: liberation from, or restoration of elite interest?. *Asian Ethnicity*. 1-18.

Rutherford, J. (1990). *A place called home: identity and the cultural politics of difference*. Dalam Jonathan Rutherford, A place called home: identity and the cultural politics of difference. London: Lawrence & Wishart Limited.

Santiago, J. (2012). Secularisation and nationalism: a critical review. *Social Compass*. 59 (1): 3–20.

Setara Institute. (2016). *Ambiguitas politik HAM Jokowi di Papua: sebuah laporan hak asasi manusia di Papua tahun 2016*. Jakarta: Setara Institute.

Slemon, S. (2001). *Post-colonial critical theories*. Dalam Gregory Castle, ed Postcolonial discourses: an anthology. Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Smith, A.D. (1989). The origins of nations. *Ethnic and racial studies*. 12 (3): 340-367.

Smith, A.D. (2003). *Nasionalisme: teori, ideologi, sejarah*. (Terjemahan Frans Kowa). Jakarta: Erlangga.

Suastika, I.N. (2012) Nasionalisme dalam perspektif postmodernisme, poststrukturalisme dan

postkolonialisme. *Media Komunikasi FIS*, 11 (1): 30-44.

Supriatma. A.M.T. (2013). TNI/Polri in West Papua: how security reforms work in the conflict regions. *Indonesia 95*: 93-124.

Tapsell, R. (2015). The media and subnational authoritarianism in Papua. *South East Asia Research*. 23 (3): 319–334.

Taylor, C. (1994). *The politics of recognition*. Dalam Any Gutmann, ed. Multiculturalism: examining the politics of recognition. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Thananithichot, S. (2011). Understanding Thai nationalism and ethnic identity. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. 46 (3): 250–263.

Verkaaik, O. (2016). Violence and ethnic identity politics in Karachi and Hyderabad. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*. 39 (4): 841-854.

Vincent, A. (2010). *The politics ofhuman rightss*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wattimena, R.A.A. (2011). Menuju Indonesia yang bermakna: analisis tekstual-empiris terhadap pemikiran Charles Taylor tentang politik pengakuan dan multikulturalisme, serta kemungkinan penerapannya di Indonesia. *Studia Philosophica et Theologica*, 11 (1): 1-30.

Widjojo, M.S., et al. (2009). *Papua road map: negotiating the past, improving the present and securing the future*. Jakarta: LIPI.

Widjojo, M.S & Budiatri, A.P. (2012). UU Otonomi Khusus bagi Papua: masalah legitimasi dan kemauan politik. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 9 (1): 59-80.