



DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE IN THE LAND OF PAPUA: A REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

By

Yosephina Ohoiwutun

Master of Public Administration Program, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Cenderawasih, Indonesia

Email: oohoiwutun@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:

Received April 24, 2025

Revised May 21, 2025

Accepted June 27, 2025

Keywords:

Papua,
Development Paradigm,
Special Autonomy,
Community Empowerment,
Participatory Development

ABSTRACT

This study aims to critically examine the dynamics of development in Papua by tracing the paradigm shift from centralization to regional autonomy and special autonomy. The main focus is to understand the extent to which the development approach that has been applied is able to address the issues of welfare and independence of the Papuan people. This research uses a descriptive qualitative method with a documentary study and content analysis approach. Data sources come from development policy documents, local government reports, and academic literature discussing development theory and practice in Papua. The research findings indicate that the dominant growth paradigm during the centralized era led to development disparities, marginalization of local communities, and weak community participation in the development process. The shift toward regional autonomy and special autonomy brought hopes for self-reliance, but faced challenges related to human resource capacity, local politics, and institutional limitations. A shift toward a community-based and socially just development paradigm is beginning to emerge, but it has not yet been fully realized. Therefore, the main recommendation of this study is the importance of strengthening local institutional capacity, consistently implementing participatory development mechanisms, and integrating local values into development planning to ensure the sustainability and relevance of policies at the grassroots level

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Yosephina Ohoiwutun

Master of Public Administration Study Program, Cenderawasih University

Jl. Abepura-Sentani Uncen Campus Abepura, Abepura District, Jayapura City

Email: oohoiwutun@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

What line of thinking is used to examine the development crisis in the Land of Papua? This question needs to be raised as a reflection of the experience and history of development over 40 years in this region. During that time, the history of development has carved out a multidimensional crisis. Various development models and approaches have been applied as instruments of change, but the living conditions of the community have not progressed either. For example, the modernization paradigm, which is quite long, as long as the history of development after integration into the Republic of Indonesia, is considered a saving instrument of change. The modernization paradigm with its model of growth and accelerated development, seems to be for all nature that can deliver humans to achieve the dream of a just and prosperous society as envisioned in the fourth paragraph of the opening of the 1945 Constitution.

However, the recent emergence of challenges to the growth paradigm in Tanah Papua is motivated by a series of failures in delivering Papuans to a better material and moral condition. One aspect is that when development is identified with a growth model that puts forward the principles of trickle down effect and spread effect, it turns out that it has resulted in a small group of people who are getting richer and stronger and the majority of people who are marginalized and poor. When development is identified with accelerated growth, the patterns of development tend to

be coercive and have implications for the fragility of social and political foundations. As a result, many traditional values that have real potential to promote community development become alienated and lose their adhesive power. Even economic and physical growth has only resulted in a higher level of dependence on subsidies.

Various development indicators can be used to refer to factual references to these conditions, both from the economic and socio-cultural and political sides, such as increasing unemployment, increasing poverty rates, distortion of local cultural values, low community purchasing power, low average community education levels, high morbidity and infant mortality rates.

However, the applied model is actually a translation of a pattern and concept of development policy. Now, with the increasingly strong desire for regional independence in the context of autonomy, it requires the adaptation of development models and paradigms that are more just, democratic and humane, shifting the old paradigm that has proven not to provide a satisfactory guarantee. In the event that development is seen as a multidimensional process that takes place in balance between changes in social structure and accelerated economic growth, it requires a wise response not according to the authorities alone, but the community should be consulted. Indeed, the paradigm is not limited to the euphemism of growth or modernization with economic parameters and physical and material progress alone, but more than that, it requires non-material aspects that include the formation and development of overall social attitudes in society.

The reflection on the conception of development that has emerged in the Land of Papua in several periods of time has turned out to be the foundation that inspires the enlightenment of development planners in designing development. If the line of thought is dubious and unclear, it will only "blur the water". The history of regional development in the Land of Papua over the past 30 years has been more influenced by a centralized growth paradigm than a welfare paradigm that favors the people. Therefore, the question must be asked: is the growth paradigm still relevant in the development process in the Land of Papua? To try to answer this, it is necessary to reflect on and examine the conception of development that must be developed in the midst of the high intensity of change today, entering the era of special autonomy in the information age. In a dilemmatic condition, where on the one hand, the principle of special autonomy with its independence must be competed with global progress, while on the other hand the people in the Land of Papua are currently generally still conditioned at a low level of productivity and out of competition. As is known, today's world progress has indicated several factors such as: rotation of technological developments with a short time span, sophisticated information technology, free trade, primary service, good governance, high competition. These indications often become the basis of reference for accelerated development policies. In fact, spurring growth by utilizing external values is clearly in doubt.

Along with the reform agenda as a response to the multi-dimensional crisis that colored the development process, the government has outlined development policy steps that include four stages, namely: rescue; recovery; stabilization; and development. In its implementation, efforts are directed at increasing local capabilities in the context of broad, real and responsible autonomy towards special autonomy. Thus, the design of the development model is macro-sectoral and micro-spatial according to regional conditions in the Land of Papua, combining paradigms and development theories from various schools.

Referring to the above, the future development plan in the Land of Papua needs to be anticipated by conducting restrospection and critical evaluation to find a solution perspective. In this case, a description of strategic development issues and analysis of aspects of historical analysis are carried out, which include three stages of paradigms and schools of development theory that have been and are being adopted from the New Order to the Reform Order.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach with the method of documentation study and content analysis of development policies in Tanah Papua from the era of centralization to special autonomy. Data was collected through a review of policy documents, government reports, and relevant academic literature on development paradigms. The analysis was conducted by mapping the changes in the development paradigm historically and analyzing its impact on the social, economic and cultural conditions of the Papuan people. A qualitative approach was chosen to capture the complexity of local development experiences and understand the dynamics of paradigm shifts contextually (Fakih, 2002; Nugroho, 2003). Data validity was maintained through source triangulation and clarification of historical context and regional development policies.

3. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The failure of a paradigm to explain natural phenomena or symptoms (and or social symptoms) that constitute a new reality is due to the existence of new "elements" that were not previously predicted when the paradigm was compiled. Therefore, the first effort that needs to be made in refining or preparing a paradigm is the identification of



these elements. In relation to the conditions of Papua, the preparation and formulation of the discourse of Local Self-Reliance as an alternative approach or new paradigm of development is carried out with a starting point in efforts to identify the "elements" that are the cause of the failure of the old development approach.

1. The Centralized Era Development Paradigm

In the centralist era - when Papua was still called Irian Jaya - the development paradigm applied appeared to be a combination of theories known as described earlier, more dominant in the growth paradigm according to modernization theory. This is clearly evident in the position of Jakarta-Papua relations, where almost all ideas, concepts, plans, and guidelines for implementing development are carried out centrally, relying on the principle of trickle down effect. Although this paradigm is interspersed with the paradigm of equity and justice, it is not enough to give color to all stages of development in Papua.

In general, the development concept implemented based on this paradigm is to divide the Land of Papua into several "growth center" areas. At that time there were 4 growth centers. This concept, later turned out to cause an increasingly yawning gap between the accelerated growth center areas and the peripheral and hinterland areas which only received minimal effects. The concept was outlined in the Basic Pattern of Long-term Development, which was then operationalized in the REPELITADA and APBD and using the UDKP and Rakorbang mechanisms. In the field of education, characterized by policies and strategies to "accelerate" quality with standards determined in Jakarta based on the principle of equality for all, the national curriculum at all levels of education applies up to 70% of the entire curriculum content. The allocation of financing, personnel, and other management facilities, as well as the determination of development programs in the field of education are not designed by the Regional Government. The same is true in other areas, including the economy. The scale of economic development in Papua at that time was among the smallest compared to other provinces in Indonesia. The mining and oil and gas sectors, which are the mainstay of Papua's wealth, are controlled by Jakarta and returned to Papua only in small amounts (a maximum of 30% of the profits received by the State). In the field of population, on the basis of population distribution alone without regard to the quality aspect, the Central Government sends large numbers of transmigrants to Papua. The Papuan government and people just accept it without being seriously involved in the planning.

In this era of development, an equalization paradigm based on articulation theory was also applied, where various development programs in villages were pursued using a "community grouping" strategy. Various small development nodes emerged in the villages, such as: KSM, POKMAS, etc. Which is intended so that the community can jointly in its group design its own needs plan by means of joint production. For example: The Inpres Desa Tertinggal (IDT) Program, JPS, and Integrated Area Development, BANGDES Program, with a mentoring pattern. These programs are carried out on a micro-spatial scale but are designed on a macro-scale by the government.

For Papua, this series of facts only creates perpetual dependency. Law No. 5 of 1974, which underlies the implementation of regional government, is not strong enough to be used as an argument to shift authority from Jakarta to Papua. In fact, in all cases, the task of the Provincial or Regency/City Government is limited to proposing. The Regional Development Planning Agency, which was established in Papua in 1976, cannot act as a functional institution, because its role has been unclear both as a development coordinator and as a development controller. Because of this lack of clarity, Bappeda often acts as the executor of development.

Some of the signals about the failure of development in Papua at that time were a form of expression of regret for the treatment of central government policies in Papua which turned out to only cause deviation from the goals to be achieved. The cause is clear, structural factors as a result of the theory of modernization with its growth paradigm, including: problems of budget allocation that are not timely in accordance with the urgent needs of the community, top-down mechanisms that are more dominant, as well as discipline on the mechanism of planning rules that apply, the measure of success used is less precise.

2. Development Paradigm in the Era of Regional Autonomy

National reforms have brought some fundamental changes to the Land of Papua. Starting with the shift of authority from Jakarta to the regions in the context of decentralization of government through Law No. 22 of 1999 and Law No. 25 of 1999. A further implication of the law is that the Regency / City Government in the Land of Papua began to have its own authority to develop their respective regions, except in 6 matters, namely: foreign affairs, defense, monetary, judiciary, religion, and others.

This era is characterized by the accumulation of development problems caused by past conditions. One problem after another surfaced. On the other hand, the government is not stable enough to run the government and design its development plans. The long-standing crisis in the Land of Papua has continued. A number of unfavorable political events have contributed to the development performance, which was already stumbling. Practically, the pace of development in this era is running slowly without energy. The parties were more preoccupied with fixing political

problems and adjusting new policies as well as reorganizing government organizations and regional development plans.

The emergence of a new awareness for the people in the Land of Papua seemed to lead the government and development towards a very drastic change. In less than four years, the era of regional autonomy has only produced a number of new icons of development, such as: the growing emotional attitude that gave birth to the term "sons of the region", "being masters in their own country", which coincides with the increasing pressure of some groups of people who want to be independent. Local government policy to justify this is protective. This means that development in the Land of Papua must give priority to Papuans. It is well realized that during the New Order Government in the era of centralized development, Papuans were ignored as the main object of development. Some of the progress made during this era was to reduce the number of unemployed people by recruiting more than 3,000 new civil servants in three stages, dominated by Papuans. In addition, adjustments were made to the organizational structure and promotions for Papuans in all important echelons. Progress was also made in empowering community institutions. Along with the reform era, community institutions have grown and developed strongly to become partners of the government in development.

It is unfortunate, because during this period of time it has not been possible to expand employment outside the government sector. This is due to two main factors: the lack of quality human resources, and the limited capitalization of local businesses. Recruitment and promotion policies within the government bureaucracy pay little attention to quality. Departmental working relationships have developed negatively towards narrow primordialism. The emergence of new phenomena that tend to be inefficient in development, as well as the growth of social community institutions are not well controlled.

The positive side of this new awareness is the strengthening of a common vision towards local self-reliance in the context of the Republic of Indonesia. This means that the weakness of human resources in the midst of the strength of abundant natural resources has begun to be realized. Development in all fields and sectors is not optimal and only breeds distrust of the people in the government. The level of education is low, the degree of public health is low, the poverty level of the people is very severe, the infrastructure is inadequate. What is wrong? Such is the question that often arises in various development discourses in this region. The idea then arose to cut dependence on the central government and start pro-actively empowering the community in all aspects of life.

The growth-oriented development paradigm is no longer the *prima donna*. But what is put forward is the paradigm of equitable development that is humane and environmentally sound. The periodization of this short era can only produce a development framework based on "independence" that establishes the basic foundations for its continuation in the next era. The paradigm developed still revolves around the theory of modernization, but puts forward Weber's theory of protestant ethics, McLelland's theory of N-Ach, and Inkeles' theory of humane development. A people's economy was put forward, where all aspects of the regional economy began to be designed from the community to the macro level. The implementation of populist economic strategies in the past was only pseudo and half-hearted, because it did not help the poor at all. Improving the quality of human resources starts from the basic education level with a dormitory pattern and cadre through the development of educational cooperation with advanced educational institutions at home and abroad. In addition, bureaucratic institutions have begun to clarify the vision and mission of their respective developments, and build partnership networks with various stakeholders.

Because most of the Papuan population lives in the rural areas, relatively still in need of guidance, the pattern of assistance is used as a pattern of empowerment is very relevant, involving the role of reformers in the village, such as community leaders, traditional leaders, religious leaders, and NGOs. In its application, the pattern of community empowerment in rural areas and communities in urban areas is not equalized, because in addition to different socio-economic characteristics, the presence of variants of community institutional strength in the two areas shows their respective identities.

The pattern of community development in rural and inland areas requires a situational approach that is in accordance with the cultural order and customs of local communities. The concepts of trickle down effect, spread effect, and security approach are no longer used effectively, but instead prioritize the concept of a populist economy that truly favors the community through providing high access for the community to be actively involved in the entire development process. The starting point is the principle of development from and by the community. Therefore, bottom-up mechanisms continue to be encouraged with the prerequisite of efforts to gradually and continuously improve the capacity of the community and village/city and district government officials as well as the reallocation of adequate rural and urban development budgets according to the level of need.

3. Development Paradigm of the Special Autonomy Era

Law No. 21 of 2001 became the main reference for a new paradigm for the continuation of the development process in Papua. This law not only reaffirms the autonomy of Law 22/1999, but is also labeled "special". The specificity is characterized by local characteristics that are based on "culture" and "government format". The



development orientation in this era is basically a follow-up to the development design in the previous era which has been framed in the perspective of autonomy and independence. With the growing awareness of underdevelopment in various aspects of development, development policies, strategies and programs have been intensified. This is supported by the additional allocation of financing, OTSUS funds in addition to DAU / DAK. The special autonomy fund management policy is determined based on the demands of development needs in each Regency / City in Papua in the form of sharpened priority programs.

Several important things that are still a serious obstacle in the context of sustainable development in this era are: First, the division of provinces and regencies based on Law Number 45 of 2000. This event has had a major impact on security stability in Papua Province and has drained a lot of energy, thought and money in its efforts to resolve it. But until now it has not been resolved. Secondly, the structure and performance of the bureaucracy has yet to be resolved, following the establishment of the Papuan People's Assembly (MRP). Third, there is no agreed terms of reference for development based on the spirit of special autonomy and Fourth, the intensity of political problems is increasing.

Entering the fourth year of the implementation of Papua's special autonomy, despite the serious obstacles that accompany it, significant progress has been made, especially in the four priority areas of development, namely: education, health, people's economy, and infrastructure. A number of indications that have been used as measures are: First, economic growth is getting better, reaching 4.5% with GRDP reaching 8.13%. This condition shows that priority programs can move the wheels of the Papuan economy and can help build community capital. The food security improvement program and the agribusiness development program have been able to increase productivity, expand planting areas and develop technology, develop businesses to increase added value for farmers, and re-energize people's cooperatives. Secondly, in the education sector, the number of Papuans educated to doctoral level has increased, the school enrollment rate (APK & APM) for primary, secondary and vocational schools has increased, the quality and number of teachers at various levels of education has increased, and educational infrastructure and facilities have become more adequate. Third, in the health sector, reducing the infant mortality rate to 80/1000, improving the nutritional quality of the population, increasing disease control efforts so as to reduce mortality and morbidity, increasing the quality and number of medical and paramedical personnel, and the spread of health service centers, both by the government and the private sector. Things that are still in serious and sustainable efforts to overcome are HIV / AIDS where Papua is among the most at risk in Indonesia and malaria control. Fourth, in the infrastructure sector, we have succeeded in increasing the number of roads to 811,998 km and handling 512 meters of bridges in various districts / cities, building airports in Sentani, Sorong, Mimika, and several other areas, adding land, sea / river and air transportation facilities.

The affiliated development paradigm is to continue the paradigm applied in the previous era (the era of regional autonomy), with a combination of approaches that are more loaded on community empowerment. The development programs that were achieved began to provide ample space for the community from the planning process to monitoring. Communities have been involved in the decision-making process to identify and determine their own needs. Some of the approach mechanisms used to date include the RPJMK (Medium-Term Village Development Plan), the District Development Program, and the Village Empowerment Program, all of which are based on the community. The pattern of assistance and involvement of stakeholders in this case is something that is required.

Such a pattern of development approach justifies people-centered development, while at the same time cutting the dependence of the village community on the upper level of government. In the long run, it can eliminate the categories: center, periphery, hinterland, or central area, semi-periphery area, periphery area, and enclave, but turn into all centers, the community as the center of development. It can also mean a reduction in the trickle-down approach because it is really bottom-up and no longer top down in the village. It is unfortunate, because along with this success, the financing aspect is still the authority and responsibility of the kabupaten/kota. Although it is suspected that this will lead to a new centralization at the provincial or district/city level, the arguments put forward are quite reasonable, because for the current conditions, communities in the villages and districts are still considered not capable enough to manage the financing aspects.

4. CONCLUSION

The development process in Papua has experienced three important phases characterized by their respective paradigms and constraints. These three phases have provided development colors for the Papuan people with all their uniqueness. With the enactment of the regional autonomy and special autonomy laws, there was a shift in the nuances of development that began to slowly leave the growth paradigm and prioritize a more humane development paradigm. Since the last two development phases, the adaptation and adoption of modernization theory with its growth paradigm has begun to be gradually abandoned. It seems that in the future the growth paradigm will be replaced by a development paradigm that is more in line with "humane" measures and community empowerment.

During the centralized New Order era, the Bottom-Up Strategy was often heard as a mere political commodity, but as an economic commodity, it was rarely or never seen implemented in the village. The dominance of Top-Down is very strong in the development planning system up to the village, while showing the arrogance of the interests of the planners themselves. The development advances that have been achieved up to 2005 can actually still be optimized by trying to eliminate the various political obstacles that accompany central-regional relations, and relations between regions in the Land of Papua. In connection with the implementation of a broad, real and responsible regional autonomy policy based on the principles of special autonomy, it is necessary to adapt government bureaucratic institutions and development models that are democratic, aspirational, equitable and more favorable to the people. In addition, it is necessary to revitalize and refunctionalize the government apparatus with a cultural and environmental perspective. In this context, it is also necessary to adapt the development paradigm that is more in line with the context of development needs.

Basically, the community needs concrete actions that can be directly accessed and enjoyed. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the variants of action programs that are accommodated in more specific social planning and economic planning. Local socio-cultural values need to be transformed within the framework of community empowerment and integrated in the performance of governance and development at the village to district level. Development planning systems and procedures need to be consistently adapted in accordance with the principles of the development paradigm that is oriented towards community empowerment towards self-reliance. Therefore, it is necessary to enhance the role of development planning and implementation institutions at the village level up to the district/city and provincial levels. To avoid the possibility of an unobjective reduction of program proposals or the loss of program proposals from the village, it is necessary to have a documentation system for plan proposals (planning documents that are consistently flowed from the bottom up).

It is necessary to build partnerships with all stakeholders to seek and find a common vision and mission for development. In this regard, there is a need for a formal cooperation forum among community institutions in each village, district, and regency. Through this formal forum, integrated information cooperation is established within a macro-sectoral and micro-spatial framework. Initiate a populist economic strategy in the midst of the community, where the development planning designed should seriously and obviously involve the lowest level of society. This requires a reconstruction of planning models that are applicable and flexible in accordance with the conditions of the people in each region, followed by fiscal decentralization down to the district level, which in turn is reduced to the village level. The shift in the development paradigm from centralization to decentralization means that it requires an increased role for regional independence. Therefore, district/municipal governments need to address and accommodate several important prerequisites that require serious attention, such as: improving the quality of human resources as a top priority.

REFERENCES

- [1] Effendi, S. (1992). *Building Human Dignity The Role of Social Sciences in Development*. Gadjah Mada Univesity Press. Yogyakarta.
- [2] Fakih, M. (2002). *The Collapse of Development Theory and Globalization*. Insist Press. Yogyakarta
- [3] Kamarsyah, R. (2012). *Regional Planning Subject Matter*. UT Module. Jakarta. Karunia.
- [4] Kasryno, F. & Stepanek, J. F. (1985). *Dynamics of Rural Development*. Gramedia. Jakarta.
- [5] Musa'ad, M. A. (2002). *Strengthening Regional Autonomy Under the Shadow of Disintegration*. ITB Publisher. Bandung.
- [6] Nugroho D. R. (2003). *Reinventing Development Reorganizing the Development Paradigm to Build a New Indonesia with Global Advantage*. Elex media Komputindo-Gramedia. Jakarta.
- [7] Owens, E. & Show, R. (1972). *Development Reconsidered*. Lexington Books. London.
- [8] Papua Provincial Government. (2004). Statement of Accountability of the Governor of Papua Province before the Regional House of Representatives of Papua Province. Report. Jayapura
- [9] Silo, A. (2004). *The Pebbles of Regional Autonomy in Papua Province: New Governance in an Escalation of Conflicts of Interest*. Research Report on the GDS (Government Decentralization Survey) in Papua in cooperation with Gadjah Mada University.
- [10] Sumule, A. (2003). *One and a Half Years of Papua Special Autonomy Reflections and Prospects*. Manokwari: ToPanG Foundation Publisher
- [11] Susanto, H. (2003). *Regional Autonomy and Local Competence*. Millennium Publisher. Jakarta.
- [12] Suwondo, K. (2002). Civil Society Plurality and Local Democratization Efforts in Democratization and Poverty. *Journal of Social Analysis*, 7(2).
- [13] Solossa, J. P. (2005). *Papua's Special Autonomy in the Face of National Disintegration*. Dissertation. Bandung: Padjadjaran University.



-
- [14] UNDP. (2005). *Capacity Assessment Profile For Selected Districts Of Papua*. Research Report. Jayapura.
- [15] Law Number 22 of 1999 Regional Government.
- [16] Law Number 25 of 1999 on Financial Balance between the Central and Regional Governments Directorate General of Fiscal Balance.
- [17] Law No. 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for Papua Province

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK