

**ACCELERATING THE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE WELFARE  
COMMUNITY IN THE LAND OF PAPUA**

**Markus Karath<sup>1</sup>**  
**University of Padjadjaran, Indonesia**

---

**ABSTRACT:** *Papua like "beautiful flower garden" in the east of Indonesia, filled with all the work and the creator of universe creation, people often dubbed as "little heaven fell to the earth" (land of paradise). Soil rich with a variety of natural resources, both living, growing and contained therein, although it has been exploited in such a way, along with the development of modern human civilization, but because of the large reserves of natural resources on earth Papua keep it beautiful like a bird of Cenderawasih. However the ironic by the fact that there is in Papua today. Called ironic because so many policies imposed in Papua to overcome the existing problems but the reality is far from what is expected. This paper focuses on how the accelerated development for the welfare of society in Papua. This paper consists of three sections: the first section Introduction, discussed the general overview of Papua, Images reality of people's lives in Papua, and the problems faced by the people in Papua. The second part of the discussion, discuss How accelerated development for the welfare of society in Papua, and the third part of the conclusion. Hopefully what is presented in this paper can be brought into a better understanding of the accelerated development for the welfare of society in Papua.*

**KEYWORDS:** Development, Papua

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Papua like "beautiful flower garden" in the east of Indonesia, filled with all the work and the creator of universe creation, people often dubbed as "little heaven fell to the earth" (land of paradise). Soil rich with a variety of natural resources, both living, growing and contained therein, although it has been exploited in such a way, along with the development of modern human civilization, but because of the large reserves of natural resources on earth Papua keep it beautiful like a bird of Cenderawasih . However the ironic by the fact that there is in Papua today. Called ironic because so many policies imposed in Papua to overcome the existing problems but the reality is far from what is expected.

Emerging problems should be taken seriously and appropriately so that people do not dissolve in economic backwardness, social (education, health and poverty), infrastructure and culture. Policy decisions to deal with the problems in Papua always seen from the political side is how to keep the government's image in the eyes of the world. This imaging politics often makes a policy ineffective, inefficient and poorly targeted.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D Candidate in Public Administration, University of Padjadjaran; E-mail : markuskarath@yahoo.co.id

Images of the reality of people's lives in Papua today is also illustrated through the documentary film *In the East of the Sun*. On one side of the film depicts the beauty of nature in the mountains of Papua, but in other parts of the film is the true story about the life of the Papuans of the economy, education, health, infrastructure, political, cultural and religious. Although this film tells about the life of people there at the foot of the mountains of Papua Jayawijaya of aspects of education, health, economic, infrastructure, politics and culture, but similar circumstances experienced by Papuans are no other region in Papua. The story of the life of the Papuans of social and economic side of it boils down to a prolonged horizontal conflict.

The problem faced by the people in Papua should be overcome with goodwill and genuine intentions by government through policies that regulate and accommodate the interests of the community. The policy was initially considered to be the most phenomenal and spectacular is the Special Autonomy policy in place since 2001. With guided by the spirit of reform and decentralization (autonomy), the Papua Province granted special powers and duties set forth in Act No. 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua Province. Later in the implementation, the Act No. 21 of 2001 amended sebagaimana stipulated in Law No. 35 Year 2008 concerning PERPU Determination No. 1 of 2008 on the Amendment Act No. 21 of 2001 Amendment Act No. 21 of 2001 is none other than to accommodate the (insert) West Papua Province into the Special Autonomy Law in order to have a strong legality, especially in the allocation of Special Autonomy Fund.

Special autonomy (asymmetric decentralization) is a response and a response to the demands of people who want a serious concern as well as a more dignified treatment for the people of Papua. This policy is intended to give responsibility and authority specifically like provincial government and district / city in the land of Papua to deal with and regulate the activities of government and provide the best service to the community through the development of various fields.

Jacobus Perviddy Solossa (2005) in his dissertation in Social and Political Science Graduate Program, University of Padjadjaran Bandung, said the main reason the implementation of special autonomy for Papua Province is to prevent the disintegration of the nation. Further stated that the special autonomy (asymmetric decentralization) is given to a region or regions due consideration typical of the area. From the historical side, Solossa (2005: 65) points out examples of some countries in the world that provides the status of asymmetric decentralization (autonomy) to the territory which Cordillera province and province of Mindanao in the Philippines, zansibar in Tanzania, a special region of Hong Kong in China, Greenland in Denmark, Puerto Rico in relation to the United States, Scotland, in relation to England and Bogainville in Papua New Guinea. Asymmetric decentralization (autonomy) provided by the state (government) to the region on the basis of hisoris, geographic, economic, political and socio-cultural.

Reflecting on the experience of some countries mentioned above were granted special autonomy for the region, it is the policy of special autonomy for Papua and West Papua is an acknowledgment of the state (central government) of the existence of socio-cultural and special treatment for the life of the Papuans. Level of civilization from the traditional to the modern today requires a social mechanism that can be set. The mechanism in question is a special autonomy policy. With this policy, the Papuan people get special treatment because of geographical considerations, demographic, socio-cultural, political and historical considerations.

In a normative sense welfare (well-being) is a broad sense though he has narrowed with frills word behind, for example social welfare. Since the first definition of social welfare is covering a wide range of human actions taken to achieve the level of people's lives better, while according to the formulation of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 6 of 1974 on the basic provisions of social welfare Article 2, paragraph 1, are:

"A system of social life and the material and spiritual living that pervaded by a sense of safety, decency and peace outwardly and inwardly, which allows for any citizen to hold a business meeting needs as-needs physical, spiritual and social as well as possible for themselves, their families and community to uphold the rights and human obligations in accordance with Pancasila ".

Broad formulation of social welfare also adopted Law No. 11 of 2009, the Social Welfare as a replacement product prior legislation. According to this Act is a social welfare conditions for the fulfillment of material needs, spiritual, social and citizens in order to live a decent and able to develop themselves, so it can perform its social function. More broadly sense, according Nasikun (1993) concept of wealth is defined as the equivalent of the meaning of the concept of human dignity can be seen from four indicators, namely: (1) security (security), (2) Welfare (welfare), (3) Freedom ( freedom), and (4) identity (Identity). Meanwhile, according Drewnoski (1974) in Bintarto (1989), see the concept of the welfare of the three aspects; (1) with respect to the level of physical development (somatic status) such as nutrition, health, life expectancy; (2) by looking at the mental level, (mental / educational status) such as education, employment, and so on; (3) with respect to the integration and social position (social status).

From the broad formulation also affect the number of indicators used to measure well-being. Usually the most common indicators and is often used to measure the level of well-being is an economic indicator, which then pursued again be an indicator of the level of income and then your calorie intake or food consumed by the family or community. Among the economic indicators are widely used by international agencies, among others, income per capita (GNP or PDB) and the amount of savings that is then associated with indicators of economic growth.

Regarding the per capita indicators among others in the form of GNP or PDB, even though its existence is often used as one of the macroeconomic indicators, especially for measuring

economic growth, but these indicators can describe the welfare and prosperity of society. At least from an economic standpoint, the presence of these indicators are often also used as a reference to see the level of social welfare. More specifically related to the amount of income of the people is often used to measure the level of social welfare, especially in relation to the consumption and production of goods and services by the public in a given period.

Another indicator that is often used to measure the welfare of society is the quality of life index (IKH) or Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI). IKH is usually used to measure the welfare and prosperity of the community when macroeconomic indicators used to measure economic success can not give an idea of the welfare society more fully. For example, the national income of a nation can grow continuously, but without being followed by an increase in social welfare, then the existence of IKH become an important indicator to look for reasons why this happens. Usually IKH is calculated based on (1) the average rate of life expectancy at the age of one year, (2) the infant mortality rate, and (3) the literacy rate. In this index, the average rate of life expectancy and infant mortality will be able to describe the nutritional status of children and mothers, health status, and family environment directly associated premises family welfare. Education is measured by literacy rates, can describe the number of people who gain access to education as a result of development.

Another indicator that the existence of a very popular is the Human Development Index (IPM / IPM). Is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), who pioneered the manufacture or use of human development indicators (IPM) as an attempt to supplement or enhance some of the existing indicators. The basic idea underlying this index made is the importance of considering the quality of human resources. According to UNDP, the development should be directed to the development of human resources. In this sense, the development can be defined as a process that aims to develop options that can be performed by humans. It is based on the assumption that improving the quality of human resources will be followed by the opening of a wide range of options and opportunities to make choices or the way human life freely.

Based on the complexity of the problems that exist, then lifted the research questions, namely: How to Accelerate Development for the welfare of society in Papua?

## **DISCUSSION**

Economic growth is considered as an important factor in human life, but it does not automatically affect the promotion of the dignity and human dignity. In this connection, there are three components that are considered crucial in the development of longevity and healthy namely, acquisition and development of knowledge (education), and increasing access to a better life. This index is created by combining three components, namely (1) the average life expectancy at birth, (2) the average educational attainment level of elementary, junior high, and high school, and (3) income per capita are calculated based on Purchasing Power Parity (purchasing power).

World Bank (2006) pointed out that in general poverty in the world today due to (1) study the majority of the population are low; (2) the type and number of jobs is limited; (3) gender inequality; (4) access to services and basic infrastructure are low and, (5) the geographical location of the poor average is in place that is difficult to reach. This condition is mostly experienced by the developing countries of Africa region, Asia and Latin America. Indonesia is facing this situation and there is inequality between regions, especially areas that are geographically very hard to reach so people do not have access to adequate public services.

After a few years of the Special Autonomy policy is implemented, followed by other policies that try to perfect and improve the policy has been effective so desired objectives more easily achieved in a more effective and efficient in order to improve the welfare of the people in Papua. As noted, after more than a decade traveling the special autonomy since 2001, the government on 20 September 2011 signed two Presidential Decree. First, the Presidential Decree on the Acceleration of Development in Papua and West Papua, and secondly, the Presidential Decree regulating agency that serves to coordinate and synchronize ie Unit Acceleration of Development in Papua and West Papua. Both of these policies other than an attempt to address a number of issues and gaps that exist, is also a form of recognition that there are problems related to the implementation of special autonomy which is not in accordance with what was expected, both by local governments and the people of Papua, also by the central government.

The purpose of accelerated development of Papua and West Papua as stated by the Minister of National Development Planning / Head of Bappenas are: (1) to improve the welfare of the people of Papua and West Papua Province; (2) to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of accelerated development, efforts are needed coordination, synergy, and synchronization of development activity planning, budgeting, and control of implementation, between the Central Government and the Provincial Government of Papua and West Papua; and (3) the acceleration of development carried out by considering the problems and challenges faced, and the utilization of the potential and excellence in each province.

No doubt that in some cases the implementation of special autonomy is not effective and not optimal, especially if associated with a major goal to be achieved. Even in some cases can be expressed more extreme, where specifically stated autonomy has failed because it has not been able to give a sense of identification with the basic rights of indigenous Papuans, as mandated in the Act (Act) No. 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for Papua, as amended by Act No. 35 of 2008 on Special Autonomy for Papua and West Papua. This fact has become a concern to many people for a long time and have fought together in order to be overcome with the intent not to stop a number of steps that have been done, but to evaluate the policy. The goal is to make improvements and enhancements that what has been done can be increased or accelerated in order to improve the welfare of society in Papua.



Among the efforts to accelerate the implementation of special autonomy in Papua, President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono in the first five years of his tenure issuing new policies for Papua through Presidential Decree No. 5 of 2007 regarding how to accelerate development in the provinces of Papua and West Irian Jaya (West Papua). The existence of this Instruction is expected to support the implementation of special autonomy, because of the political and financial support that is larger than the central government. However, in implementation, this presidential instruction was not effective as expected. The lack of support was also given the central government to local governments in Papua and West Papua in the making of laws implementing the Special Autonomy Law, including special regional regulation (PERDASUS) and Special Areas Regulations (Perdasi) is one of the factors that encourage the opposition (rejection) of the policy special autonomy.

In this regard, in order to realize the mandate of the special autonomy, the government of Papua province at the time saw the importance of the fulfillment of the basic rights of the Papuan people to improve. Fulfillment of basic rights is done by setting the 4 (four) main agenda to be implemented namely: 1) the development of the field of education; 2) the development of the health sector; 3) development of infrastructure facilities; and, 4) economic empowerment. Fourth is a priority agenda of the principal in the implementation of special autonomy because it is a very touching and needs related to the basic rights of the Papuan people to get a dignified development services in the fields of education, health, infrastructure and economic empowerment.

Funding of special autonomy from the central government at the beginning of the implementation of this policy is focused on the activities of the four main programs by varying the percentage of the allocation of funding for activities in the field of education, the allocation of funds for infrastructure development, the allocation of funds in the budget allocation for the health and empowerment economic community.

The dynamics that exist and are associated with the implementation of the Special Autonomy Law that they do not meet the expectations and desires of the people of Papua, the policy of accelerating the development of Papua and West Papua comes with a detailed document titled Fast Action Plan which is Manifests Acceleration of Development of Papua and West Papua in 2011 -2014. Both of these policies are expected as a tool that is able to stimulate and accelerate the implementation of the mandate of the Special Autonomy Law contents are still not optimal in the public welfare in Papua.

Another policy that is in line with efforts to accelerate the development of Papua and West Papua is Presidential Decree No. 84 of 2012 on Procurement of Goods / Services in the Context of Acceleration of Development of Papua and West Papua are essentially intended to provide access and opportunities for indigenous Papuans to get project- project budget by way of direct appointment (not through an auction mechanism of goods / services of government). In the PERPRES arranged that local entrepreneurs (Papuans) that exist in the central mountainous area of the project budget can get a maximum of Rp 1,000,000,000; (One billion dollars) and at the district / city Rp 500.0000000; (Five hundred million

dollars) through direct appointment (without going through the auction process). With this policy the government hopes that employers can gain access Papuans and significant impact on the budget so as to drive the local economy (increase incomes).

In addition there are also government regulations that govern the construction of roads and bridges in order to Accelerate Development in Papua and West Papua through Presidential Decree No. 40 of 2013. Another policy that was issued by the Ministry of Public Works that the development of infrastructure facilities should use local resources . Such a policy is closely related to the level of expensiveness in Papua, different levels with other regions in Indonesia. In this regard, there are three steps to overcome the problem of expensiveness level, namely the opening of new roads, infrastructure and adding new aircraft, especially in areas classified as rural areas.

Referring to the BPS report (2011), IPM Papua until 2006, five years after the special autonomy imposed and the expansion (the formation of new autonomous regions), no significant increase, even tend to stagnate. Of the 33 provinces in Indonesia, Papua IPM ranks very end is 33, and this position continued until 2010. While West Papua better though still relatively low, on the order of 30, higher than the NTT and NTB. Both of these provinces have a low IPM in addition to not have abundant natural resources such as in Papua and West Papua will not get special treatment (special) from the government.

In 1996, IPM Papua province is 60.2 second bottom after West Nusa Tenggara and lower than the national index of 67.7. In the era of special autonomy is still the same condition, which lags behind other regions in Indonesia, although some progress has been achieved. For example, until 2009, the Province of Papua is still in the down position. Of the 33 provinces, Papua actually finished last with a IPM of 64.53 (national index of 71.76).

This means that these facts can be interpreted that the high rate of poverty in Papua - as shown by the official data released by the government - in parallel or in line with the composite indicator in the form of a low human development index. Index data is a measurement of the depth of Poverty and Poverty Severity Index Statistics conducted in 2011 pointed to the fact that in line with a low IPM levels, as seen in Table below.

Table 1.1  
Depth of Poverty Index, Provinces of Papua and West Papua (Years 2007-2012)

<i>PROVINSI</i>	<i>Y E A R S</i>					
	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2012</i>
Papua	10,84%	10,84%	9,07%	9,36%	7,86%	-
Papua Barat	12.97%	9.18%	9.75%	10.47%	8.78%	-

(Source : BPS, 2013)

Figures Poverty Depth Index is still higher than any province in Indonesia. This condition shows that the depth of poverty in the province of Papua and West Papua percentage is greater when juxtaposed with the total population. The average depth of poverty in these two provinces scattered in areas remote (far inland and coastal areas).

Likewise, the Poverty Severity Index in Papua Province in 2011 reached 2.81% and West Papua approximately 3.43%. Percentage of poverty severity index in 2011 it did not move away from the percentage of poverty severity index in the year 2009 where the Papua Province of 2.98% and 3.43% of West Papua Province (BPS 2011). Without further analysis, the figure above shows that there is a problem that is quite crucial in the land of Papua, namely the development gap which leads to low levels of social welfare.

Report of the Ministry of Rural Development in 2013 on 183 areas classified as still lagging (read: the poorest) in Indonesia, showed that all regions (districts / cities) in Papua and West Papua, including disadvantaged areas. According to the Ministry of Rural Development (PDT) areas classified as severely impoverished areas due to: (i) the economic conditions of society which includes percentage of poor and per capita consumption, (ii) human resources are the main indicators of life expectancy, the average length of school and literacy rates, (iii) infrastructure (infrastructure) with the main indicators of the widest number of road surface asphalt / concrete, paved roads, dirt roads, and other roads, the percentage of users of electricity, telephone and water, the amount of village with a market without a permanent building, the number of health infrastructure / 1000 population, the number of physicians / 1000 population, the number of elementary and junior / 1000 population, (iv) the ability of local finance with the main indicators of fiscal gap, (v) the accessibility of the main indicators of the average distance from the village to the district, the distance to the education ministry, the number of villages with access to health services is greater than 5 km, and (vi) the characteristics of the area with the main indicator of the percentage of villages prone to earthquakes, landslides, floods, and other disasters, the percentage of villages in protected areas, critical landless rural and conflict-prone village last year. With these criteria, then there are currently 183 districts are categorized as Underdeveloped Regions in Indonesia. Deployment disadvantaged areas most (70%) are currently underdeveloped regions in eastern Indonesia, particularly in the provinces of Papua and West Papua.

Special autonomy by the people of Papua interpreted as a welfare policy Papuans from various tribes and sub-tribes. Meaning of "hosted in their own land" is that people have the quality of life much better and more dignified life that is prosperous. Essentially the Papuan people do not feel safe despite a number of policies that are specifically intended to address this issue.

Many facts show that economic growth in Papua continues to increase every year. Likewise, the public revenue and allocation of funds used to improve public services such as education and health where every year there were an increasing number of health centers, the number of doctors and nurses and medical or health infrastructure. It is also noted an



increase in the number of teaching and learning facilities by increasing the number of teachers and community participation in the learning process. But on the other hand a lot of evidence that shows that people still do not prosper, as seen from a high poverty rate, the number of cases of the deadly disease and so on.

Thus confirming the fact that what is referred to as welfare is complex and wide so that the indicators used to assess the success of a development program should also be broad and contextual. In this context it is also precisely what the conclusion of anthropological research conducted in a number of prominent Papuan see development in Papua (Partnership: 2012), that the development model that is run for Papua has so far not considered appropriate because tend to be oriented to the modernization of society because it is based on the reasoning modernization strong.

"In fact, the orientation of progress with measures of material that is not compatible with the existence of a local culture of Papua. While on the other hand, the system of values, way of life and traditions of the Papuan people are less likely to accept change, even in a certain degree rather anti changes. By their omission of the collision this perspective, it is no wonder if it appears the notion that the development paradigm Papua contrary to local cultural paradigm. The designers of the technocratic policy and continue to insist holding his view even consider the local culture of Papua as a resistor (resistor) acceleration of development in Papua. What did the first time to achieve progress is to change and or even eliminate the culture that is considered contrary to the values of modern life. But in fact, the aggressive nature of the technocratic development paradigm gets the cultural resistance of the Papuans themselves so that both are at the mutually negating each other. These conditions can be seen from the 10-year regional development program in the form of special autonomy in Papua and West Papua ".

Furthermore, according to a study conducted Partnership, stated that putting development paradigms and paradigm of local culture on the mutually exclusive positions will not benefit the people of Papua and West Papua. Because what you want to achieve Papuans not merely physical construction material progress alone but also comfort and happiness in terms of the development of the things that are non-material. Not only the physical body or built but also his soul. On that basis, the study proposes that the process of development and local culture placed on dialectical position.

"Development is a process of development which is a reflection of the attitude and the public response to the change, while the local culture to be a catalyst in order to achieve development that does not lead to alienation and loss of roots community locality. In this position, need to build a bridge between the development paradigm and the paradigm of the local culture so that the two are together to improve the well-being and build community pride Papua and West Papua so aligned with other areas of Indonesia ".

Preliminary conclusions proposed by the study are also consistent with the fact that the day-to-day Papua current condition is still an area that is poor and yet prosperous society,

including when it is measured by the IPM / IPM. In the context of Indonesia in general, the region of Papua is still put in areas with high poverty index numbers and areas that have a high degree of difference with the other regions in Indonesia are classified as advanced as Jakarta. Challenges related to poverty in Papua in particular not only the large number of poor people, but also the magnitude of the difference inequality between regions or regions in Indonesia.

In the context of education as well as where the majority of the people of Papua or not all of them in the category of educated in the sense already receive education up to the secondary level. It thus evidenced by the emergence of a number of complaints regarding the issue of shortage of skilled manpower in terms of skilled manpower which is derived from indigenous people. Educated workers in Papua mostly still low qualifications, while there is a huge need that needs to bring in skilled manpower from outside Papua. Who knows how long this situation can be overcome, despite many efforts to improve the quality of human resources through the various levels of education by the local governments in Papua.

Facts in the education field to confirm the notion that there are still many children Papuans who can not attend school, especially those living in the hinterlands. Also there are many children out of school, lack of learning facilities in the villages, the limitations of educators to the relatively high cost of education is a form of autonomy implementation which has not been able to be implemented properly. This fact can also be interpreted that the low and limited human resources resulted in the low level of welfare of the people of Papua.

Conditions in the health sector also Tweedledum and Tweedledee in a sense still relatively bad though admittedly there are a number of significant developments each year, especially if measured on a number of indicators of health infrastructure. If the health aspect is believed to be a factor or a very important aspect for the existence of a human in performing the activity or live their lives, then the low aspect has a strong correlation with the low level of social welfare. No one if the government through its policies put education and health aspects in important positions. The existence of both these aspects of the field or do not compete but rather complement and enhance each though not a single entity. There is a close relationship between the two, because the true purpose of education is also almost the same with health goals. Educational success is directly or indirectly have an impact on the success in the field of health, and vice versa.

Not a coincidence that since the beginning of the special autonomy policy stipulates that in addition to the field of education funds have been allocated a very large percentage, the health sector is also getting quite large allocation. This allocation is very large percentage when compared with a similar percentage applied in other areas. The amount allocated to the health sector show that health problems is still a crucial issue in Papua. Its existence is one of the key indicators that determine the IPM an area. When IPM region of Papua shall still relatively low, then the same logic also applies to the health level of the people of Papua is still relatively low.

The phenomenon of the low level of education and health in Papua is actually a phenomenon that could be interpreted as a phenomenon of low welfare of society in this region. Not surprisingly, many research findings concluded that the implementation of policy in Papua is not running as it should. This means that it is difficult to argue, that the purpose of the special autonomy has not been fully achieved. In fact, it is recognized that the goal is still far from what can be achieved up to now. The indicator is evident from the fact there are many people, especially those living in rural or isolated areas or who are still difficult to reach because of topographical and demographic factors in accessing essential services provided by local governments. The point is that there are many people in the villages who have difficulty in accessing health services and education are good.

Not a few people of Papua are still struggling with health issues such as maternal deaths and newborns, malnutrition, HIV / AIDS, tuberculosis, Ispa, malaria, leprosy to other diseases. In the field of education were more or less the same condition that is cause for concern. In fact there are many children who are not native Papuans could go to the hinterlands, there are still many children drop out of school, lack of learning facilities in the villages, the limitations of educators to the cost of education is relatively expensive.

The basic problem in the health sector are still many other residents in some areas or issues facing cases of malnutrition due to the high cost of basic needs that must be purchased, while their purchasing power is still very limited. In addition, health problems in the field of water supply is inadequate, immunization, unhealthy behaviors, epidemiology of infectious and non-communicable diseases, mental health disorders, curative health services, the spread of medical and paramedical personnel, gender equality, health budgets, and so on.

Especially with regard to HIV / AIDS, there is a tendency to increase every year. The available data indicate the second case of the deadly disease continues to increase. The number of people living with HIV and AIDS in Papua recorded at least 5,555 people. Report of the Provincial Health Office of Papua and West Papua, published by the KPA Papua Province, March 31, 2008 states that the province holds the number of people living with HIV and AIDS are 3,955 people who clarified as follows where HIV: 2,181 people, while 1,773 people AIDS. As for the province of West Papua number of people living with HIV / AIDS reached 1,600 people, of this amount 70% (1,120) are indigenous Papuans.

Based on the Ministry of Health reports first quarter 2014, from 1987 until March 2014, the accumulative number of reported HIV infections, there were 134 053. Of all provinces, 10 cities with the highest number of HIV infections in Jakarta (30 023), East Java (16 752), Papua (14 943), West Java (11 084). Bali (8543). North Sumatra (8316), Central Java (7584), West Kalimantan (4290), Kep. Riau (4086), and South Sulawesi (3961), (KPA Indonesia 2014).

Noted, during 2005 alone 108 people died of AIDS in 1000 cases that have occurred in Papua. Meanwhile, there is also the cumulative data from Papua Provincial Health

Department released the Regional AIDS Commission (KPAD) Papua that there has been a tremendous increase in speed since Sunday, January 29th, 2005 to December 31, 2005, which has reached 2,163 cases of HIV / AIDS and into 2007 this increased to 3,540 cases. Whereas the previous year (2004) reached 1,749 cases of HIV / AIDS.

Based on the existing health phenomenon in Papua can be interpreted that the fulfillment of the need for health is still a luxury item and therefore difficult to obtain, although there have been various attempts to fulfill it by increasing budget allocations required. No one if aspects or areas of education, health, economy and infrastructure is one of the important indicators that can be used to measure the level of social welfare. Each aspect or the fields into a single entity like a chain that can not be separated, so it is not wrong if it is stated that the issue of welfare is a complex and dimensional problems that can not be measured using one or two indicators of how the indicators were very popularly used and proved to be very important and has a high relevance.

Evaluation of a public policy is a must so that we can know how much output and outcomes of the policy. The output of a policy of course related to the programs and activities carried out as a mandate of the policy. While the outcomes of the policy relating to how the results of policies (programs and activities) provide real benefits and impact to people's lives.

During his visit to Indonesia a few years ago, Emmy Faleomavega, a US congressman representing Pacific countries urged the Indonesian government to immediately conduct a thorough evaluation of the implementation of special autonomy in Papua and West Papua. This evaluation is important to determine the extent of effectiveness, efficiency, equity, accuracy, adequacy and responsiveness of the public to the special autonomy. Assessment of the various groups that for 1 (one) special autonomy policy decade mainly concerned with the budget allocation (funds) special autonomy is ineffective, inefficient, poorly targeted and does not provide real benefits, so that the people in Papua are not enjoying what is called life it prosperous. The word peace is a mere rhetoric. Prosperous only as a slogan during the local elections campaign both the Governor and Regent / Mayor. This condition is reinforced by the publication of the results of Welfare Statistics survey conducted by BPS that the level of social welfare both in Papua and West Papua Province are among the lowest in Indonesia. Of the 33 provinces in Indonesia, Papua and West Papua provinces categorized as poor and was ranked first and second. BPS certainly has the size and distinctive standard in measuring and assessing the level of social welfare.

## **CONCLUSION**

Papua like "beautiful flower garden" in the east of Indonesia, filled with all the work and the creator of universe creation, people often dubbed as "little heaven fell to the earth" (land of paradise). Soil rich with a variety of natural resources, both living, growing and contained therein, although it has been exploited in such a way, along with the development of modern human civilization, but because of the large reserves of natural resources on earth Papua keep it beautiful like a bird of Cenderawasih . However the ironic by the fact

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK ([www.eajournals.org](http://www.eajournals.org))

that there is in Papua today. Called ironic because so many policies imposed in Papua to overcome the existing problems but the reality is far from what is expected. Emerging problems should be taken seriously and appropriately so that people do not dissolve in economic backwardness, social (education, health and poverty), infrastructure and culture.

Among the efforts to accelerate the implementation of special autonomy in Papua, through Presidential Decree No. 5 of 2007 regarding how to accelerate development in the provinces of Papua and West Irian Jaya (West Papua).

In order to realize the mandate of the special autonomy Papua provincial government sees the importance of the fulfillment of the basic rights of the Papuan people to improve. Fulfillment of basic rights is done by setting the 4 (four) main agenda to be implemented namely: 1) the development of the field of education; 2) the development of the health sector; 3) development of infrastructure facilities; and, 4) economic empowerment.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson James E. 2003. *Public Policy Making*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Cheema G. Shabbir & Dennis A. Rondinelli. 1983. *Decentralization and Development Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*, Berverly Hills/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Denhart Janet V. & Robert B. Denhart. 2007. *The New Public Service, Serving Not Steering*. Armonk New York/ London England : Expanded Edition.
- Dunn, William. 2003. *Pengantar Analisis Kebijakan Publik* (Edisi kedua), Yogyakarta : Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Dwijowijoto Riant N. 2004. *Kebijakan Publik : Formulasi, Implementasi dan Evaluasi*. Jakarta : PT. Elek Media Komputindo
- Dwiyanto Agus dkk. 2010. *Manajemen Pelayanan Publik : Peduli, Inklusif dan Kolaboratif*. Yogyakarta : Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Grindle, Merilee S. Grindle. 1980. *Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Jones, Charles O. 1999. *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, 3<sup>th</sup> ed. Wadsworth inc
- Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar. 1963. *Penduduk Irian Barat*. Jakarta : PT. Penerbitan Universitas.
- Malak Stepanus, 2013. *Papua Dalam Otonomi Khusus*. CV. Adoya Mitra Sejahtera, Bandung.
- Osborne David & Gaebler Ted. 1996. *Mewirauahakan Birokrasi (Reinventing Government)*. Terjemahan : Abdul Rosyd. Jakarta : Pustaka Binama Presindo.
- Parson Wayne. 2005. *Public Policy : Pengantar Teori dan Praktik Analisis Kebijakan* (Edisi Terjemahan). Jakarta : Prenada Media Group.



- Patton, Carl V. & Sawicki, David S. 1993. *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning*. New Jersey : Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Rusli, Budiman. 2013. *Kebijakan Publik : Membangun Pelayanan Ppublik Yang Responsif*. Bandung : Hakim Publishing.
- Rumbiak, Yan Pieter. 2010. *Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Kebijakan Publik, Sumber Daya Manusia Pendidikan, Prasarana dan Sarana dan Partisipasi Masyarakat Terhadap Keberhasilan Implementasi Otonomi Khusus Di Bidang Pelayanan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Di Kabupaten Sorong*. Disertasi Program Pascasarjana Universitas Satyagama, Jakarta.
- Roembiak de Mientje. 1993. *Etnografi Irian Jaya; Panduan Sosial Budaya (Buku Satu)*, Kelompok Peneliti Etnografi Irian Jaya. Jayapura : Uncen
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. Rondinelli And G. Shabbir Cheema. 1988. *“Implementing Decentralization Policies: An Introduction”*, Dalam Cheema dan Rondinelli, *Decentralization and Development, Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*. California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Sarundajang, S. H. 2005. *Pemerintahan Daerah Di Berbagai Negara*. Jakarta Kata Hasta Pustaka.
- Solossa, Jacobus Pervidya. 2005. *Otonomi Khusus Papua Dalam Menghadapi Disintegrasi Bangsa*. Disertasi Program Pascasarjana, FISIP Univesitas Padjdjaran, Bandung
- Strelan John G dan Jan A. Godschalk. 1989. *Kargoisme di Melanesia*. Jayapura : Pusat Studi Irian Jaya.
- Winarno, Budi. 2002. *Teori dan Proses Kebijakan Publik*. Jakarta : Media Pressindo

#### **Documents :**

- World Bank Report: Making the New Indonesia Work for the Poor, 2006
- Indonesian Human Development Index in 2011 (BPS)
- Indicators of Social Welfare of West Papua province in 2013 (BPS West Papua Province)
- Human Development Index West Papua province in 2012 (BPS West Papua Province)
- Act No. 21 of 2001 on Special Autonomy for Papua Province, Indonesian State Secretariat, Jakarta.

#### **Magazines, tabloids and the Daily News:**

- Radar Sorong, Saturday, November 15th, 2015
- Prism Magazine, Vol. 29, 2010, CSIS, Jakarta
- Weekly News Magazine, TEMPO, Issue August 26, 2013

#### **Electronic Reference**

- <http://www.kementerianpembangunandaerahtertinggal.go.id/2013/07/12/laporan-daerah-tertinggal-di-indonesia/tanggal-22-januari-2014>
- <http://www.bappenas.ac.id/2013/22/12/evaluasi-percepatan-pembangunan-papua-dan-papua-barat-tanggal-22-maret-2014>
- <http://www.aidsindonesia.or.id/news/6131/-1-/27/08/2014/Sail-Raja-Ampat-Peduli-AIDS-2014>