

STATE'S ROLE IN SOLVING CONFLICTS TOWARDS PROSPEROUS PAPUA IN GOOD GOVERNANCE'S PERSPECTIVE

Dr. (c) MUHAMMAD RIDHO B., S.H., M.H

Faculty of Law, Islamic university of Indonesia, Indonesia.

Email: 20932012@students.uui.ac.id, Orchid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6427-4877>.

Indonesia Council of Ulama, Indonesia.

Abstract

The evolution of the modern period necessitates that the nation is prepared to adapt to changes, particularly those brought about by the wave of globalization and modernization. The state is the only player who has a role in managing public affairs, according to the old paradigm of governance, which is centered on the state-centric paradigm. There are relatively few possibilities provided for other actors to be involved in the design and execution of policies, and the government bureaucracy is always in charge of doing so. As a result, the state manages almost all affairs, but on the other hand, as situations and conditions evolve that also call for a quick change, the state encounters implementation problems when it comes to addressing public requirements. Therefore, the researcher aimed to analyze the Indonesian government's role in solving conflicts toward Prosperous Papua from a Good Governance perspective since Papua is one of the country's regions with special autonomy.

Keywords: Indonesia, Papua, good governance, special autonomy

INTRODUCTION

The development of the current era demands the readiness of the country to respond to changes that occur, especially those brought by the wave of globalization and modernization. The paradigm of governance in the old pattern, namely the paradigm centered on the state-centric paradigm, has placed the state as the only actor who plays a role in managing public affairs (Nurdin, 2017). The formulation and implementation of practical policies are always held by the government bureaucracy and there are very few opportunities given to other actors to be involved in the formulation and implementation of policies (Nugroho, 2004). As a result, almost all affairs are taken care of by the state, while on the other hand the development of situations and conditions that also demand rapid change, causes the state to experience failures in the implementation of meeting public needs.

A new paradigm emerged to overcome the problem of governance in the implementation of public affairs, namely the so-called Good Governance paradigm. Good Governance is a governance paradigm for the implementation of public affairs by highlighting three actors as important elements, namely the government (Government), society (Civil Society), and private sector (Gedeona, 2010). Governance is defined as a process of agenda-setting and implementing rules by actors. In the governance paradigm, the pattern of public decision-making has changed, namely, it is no longer only the authority of the government but also individual or other actors (de Graaf et al., 2016). Good Governance presupposes equality in the relationship between the three actors, namely the government, society, and the private sector.

In the course of its development, various approaches have emerged in the paradigm of good governance. For example, the emergence of the idea of New Public Management (NPM) is an idea of how to best manage administration in public services with an emphasis on bureaucratic reform, the creation of new networks, the encouragement of new policy initiatives, the responsibility of new mechanisms for coordination and accountability (Christensen & Lægheid, 2011). In addition, still in this NPM paradigm, the idea of reinventing government and entrepreneurship bureaucracy initiated by Osborne and Gaebler in the context of the United States (1993) also emerged. In this concept of government entrepreneurship, the central idea is how to inject a private perspective into the government bureaucracy in the administration of public affairs. However, as in their implementation, these two approaches have a drawback, namely that they are still classified as state-centric paradigms so the focus is only on the government institutionally. Another thing is that it tends to reduce the role of the state on the one hand because of the strengthening of the role of the private sector and the lack of embracing the role of society which is also an existing actor other than the market (private) and the government.

Another idea that also emerged as a response to improvements from the existing perspective is the policy advocacy approach. This approach focuses on the community as actors who have the right to be involved in the formulation and decision-making of the public (whose decisions also concern their lives). Society in the form of activists or a social movement is an actor who must be involved in all stages of public policy. According to Santoso (2014), public policy from the policy Advocacy perspective absolutely includes the community as actors who are included in the policy process. It is based that society is an actor who has the right and relevant to determine the outcome of policy decisions that concern its interests according to what it wants through its alliance of activists and participial movements in the entire policy process (Santoso, 2014).

The policy advocacy approach becomes relevant to be applicable in decision-making that concerns public life. At its core, this approach also emphasizes reducing the dominance of the state in the process of making public policy. With this approach, Santoso (2014) explained that an important part that must be observed in this public policy advocacy movement is the raising of alliances between fellow supporters and challengers of policy ideas. From this, Santoso (2014) simplified the advocacy process as a competition between two or more coalitions. In this situation, the role of brokers and political entrepreneurs plays an important role. However, it has occurred in Indonesia until now, the author observes that in its implementation, this approach fails to be understood and tends to be misused. The implementation of this policy advocacy is often carried out under the umbrella of hostility. Open conflict becomes something that cannot be avoided because attitudes and spirits negate each other. This resulted in many activists or community movement groups only accommodating the popular vote temporarily and not thoroughly so that they were then trapped back to a state-centric perspective that emphasized the dominance of the state's role in decision-making (Escobar, 2010; Pierre & Peters, 2020).

The two approaches to public decision-making with different perspectives above reflect that

along with complex changes in society, approaches are needed that are in accordance with the reality of change in that society. A democratic political system and decentralized governance such as in Indonesia with the current political context require a more open approach to the various values and interests of the three existing actors, be it the government, society, or the private sector. Therefore, the question is how to manage public affairs in the midst of a diversity of values and interests and above the political system and governance system implemented in Indonesia, where reality shows often lead to the emergence of conflict and hostility.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methods of qualitative research were applied in this study. In-depth observations are the main emphasis of the qualitative research method. Therefore, using qualitative research methodologies might lead to a phenomenon being studied in greater detail (Creswell, 2003). The solution to the realization that all outcomes of human activity are influenced by the internal features of the individual is a qualitative study that focuses on humanism, the human individual, and human behavior. These inherent characteristics of the person in question, such as their opinions, political views, and socioeconomic background (Miles et al., 2014). While examining journals, books, and other pertinent information is how data is gathered for the study. The research data, books, journals, articles, and other materials retrieved through Google are the sources for the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The conceptualization of Good Governance accommodates the problem of conflict resolution in it. This is based on the opinion of De Graaf et al. (2016), Good Governance includes conflict management in it, especially value conflicts. This position is the author's starting point to elaborate on how the government plays a role in resolving conflicts in the regions (this paper will take the case of Papua as the focus of the conversation) through the Good Governance paradigm.

Papua is one of the provinces that has been granted special autonomy rights (Otsus, special autonomy) in the Indonesian government system. Through this special autonomy, Papua automatically receives special autonomy funds and other funds from the central government. Various fund allocations from this center are given as a way to improve the quality of meeting the needs of the public or the Papuan people, such as infrastructure, poverty alleviation, servants, the environment, and other government affairs regulated by laws and regulations.

Since the establishment of Papua as a Special Autonomous Region in 2002 until now (2017) the allocation of funds provided by the central government is quite large. From 2002 to 2016 alone or about 15 years of ongoing special autonomy, the central government has allocated development funds reaching Rp. 59.51 trillion. The fund consists of a special autonomy fund of Rp. 47.9 trillion sourced from 2% of the National General Allocation Fund (DAU) and an infrastructure fund of Rp. 11.2 trillion which is an additional infrastructure fund in the context of Papuan special autonomy. All of these funds are used for the implementation of development in Papua including a number of priority programs, namely health development, education,

people's economic empowerment, and infrastructure (Papua Today, 2017). Even so, in the news, it is also recognized that the improvement of the welfare of the Papuan people has not been optimal. The per capita income of the population of Papua Province, especially indigenous people, during the period 2010-2014 is indicated to be very slow, which is only 1.50% per year. This is certainly a problem that must be resolved. The issue of welfare has been the main issue surrounding the implementation of Papuan special autonomy from the beginning of its emergence until now. Initially, special autonomy, which was a joint agreement between the central government and the Papuan people, was implemented in the hope of increasing welfare and further reducing the level of economic inequality in society. But reality shows it is still distant wishful thinking. Various cases of conflict that cause social disharmonization and even cause casualties that occur in Papua are basically caused by the problem of economic inequality in Papua. The religious social structure that exists in Papuan society and the variety of existing values also complicate problem-solving. This requires the role of the government to be able to resolve the conflict through a more inclusive approach to various actors.

In looking at the Papuan problem, the first thing that must be done is to position the right perspective and approach to the problem at hand. How the central government sees Papua will determine the approach and lead to certain consequences. The development perspective applied by the central government must change to a way of development that focuses and focuses on improving the welfare of the Papuan people. The problem lies in how the central government transforms development issues that emphasize security development into empowerment issues with the aim of encouraging people's participation to improve their welfare.

The paradigm or perspective of Good Governance emphasizes public decision-making by including three main actors as its main elements. Meanwhile, conflict management is essentially the management of relationships between existing actors so that they do not cause destructive and harmful conflicts. From these two basic ideas, we can find that conflict management in the perspective of Good Governance is basically a matter of managing power relations between the government, society, and the private sector so that they can be in an equal position and synergize with each other to achieve the interests of each actor. In the case of Papua, we first need to map the conflicts faced through a pluralistic approach, which is to look at conflicts that occur as a result of the diversity of values and interests that clash with each other in society. The complexity of the conflict in Papua contributes to the complexity of the settlement that must be done.

As we understand, the conflict in Papua that comes to the fore is caused by various backgrounds, economic inequality issues, corporate business interests, government political interests, and the most complicated is the dual role played by state individuals in two domains, namely as a state representative and at the same time as entrepreneurs who have business interests, are some of the causes of conflicts to the surface. These complexities must be parsed one by one by grouping into the state, public and private actors as well as actors who play a biased (double) role and the interests that each actor strives for. From the diversity that has the potential to give rise to this conflict, several roles of the government through the perspective of good governance can be carried out to achieve common ideals, namely improving the

welfare of the Papuan people, including the following: First, the Government acts as a catalyst, meaning that the Government is not only the only actor who can take care of all public affairs alone, the government can delegate other public affairs that can be done by other actors either from the private sector or the community itself in accordance with the arrangements of affairs regulated through legislation.

Second, the government is a driver for the creation of open relations between the government and the private sector, and the public. Cooperation between the government and the private sector or the private sector and the community must be pursued. This requires a partisan space for the public and the private sector to be equally involved in public decision-making. A more inclusive and participatory democracy will involve community activity and encourage the growth of aspirations from the community to the government and can minimize inappropriate public policies. Therefore, the government needs to encourage the functioning of political infrastructure and superstructures that push toward participatory, not elitist, democracy.

Third, the government is an actor managing conflicts. The variety of values and interests that exist from each actor must be transformed into something that encourages the creation of a consensus that can accommodate the various interests of the actors involved. In this issue, the government needs to play a role as the party that makes the rules of the game from contestation and cooperation between the actors involved. The balance of power relations lies in the equality and balance of power between actors, the tendency of the government to side with the private sector by ignoring its relationship with society will actually cause radical structural conflicts. Conflict management can start with the equalization of perceptions and values to be applied. A deliberative democratic system can be applied to accommodate various values and interests that can then be discussed together to reach a consensus. The problem of multidimensional conflict in Papua must be responded to by the government by creating adequate channels to accommodate various interests in society. In terms of policy planning or development, the government needs to act as a facilitator. Policy formulation is carried out in a bottom-up manner, namely the aspirations of the community, while the implementation of policies can be played by the state, the community itself, or the private sector. Private interests in the pursuit of profit can be formulated in such a way that it is in line with the needs and capabilities of the community. Simply put, the government is a party that provides tools or means that bridge its interests, public interests, and private interests.

Inpruralis's view, public policy is the result of conflicts, bargaining, and coalition formations of various organizations/groups that exist in the wider community in the fight for their interests. Their main importance is actually economic importance, but in its struggle issues of ethnicity, region, religion, value, and other substances of primordialism are articulated (Kusumanegara, 2010). In the case of Papua, the state needs to reorganize the actors involved in encouraging the creation of inequality in society. Increasing the capacity of the community, stopping government officials who also participate in complicating problems with business competition through their dual roles, growing awareness of private responsibility to the community, and increasing political and legal awareness in the community are several choices of schemes that can be developed to resolve the conflicts faced. Fourth, a more adaptive and effective

bureaucratic arrangement can be useful for the implementation of a development scheme, which has patterns of change that are sometimes unpredictable. Adaptive bureaucracy, which can adjust to the values adopted by the local community, can be an effective way to achieve the desired goals. This presupposes a consensus of value on the issue of the various actors involved. The similarity of values will determine whether or not a program is efficient or effective.

CONCLUSION

Conflict occurs because of the clash of values or concerns between individuals and other individuals or groups with groups. Perspective good governance of public policy is seen as the result of the conflict and bargaining of a coalition between public, private, and government actors. In resolving the conflict in Papua, the government needs to play a role in accordance with the current social and political context. Cooperation schemes between the public, private sector, and government, with an emphasis on the government as a catalyst, stimulating the creation of more open and inclusive power relations, conflict management, and the creation of adaptive bureaucracies are expected to be an alternative choice for the government.

References

- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2011). Democracy and administrative policy: Contrasting elements of New Public Management (NPM) and post-NPM. *European Political Science Review*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773910000299>
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- de Graaf, G., Huberts, L., & Smulders, R. (2016). Coping With Public Value Conflicts. *Administration and Society*, 48(9). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399714532273>
- Escobar, A. (2010). Latin America at a crossroads: Alternative modernizations, post-liberalism, or post-development? *Cultural Studies*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380903424208>
- Gedeona, H. T. (2010). Pandangan Ilmu Administrasi Publik Mengenai Signifikansi Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Penyelenggaraan Negara. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Dan Praktek Administrasi*, 7(4), 07.
- Kusumanegara, S. (2010). Model dan aktor dalam proses kebijakan publik. *Gava Media*.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Nugroho, R. (2004). *Kebijakan publik: Implementasi dan pengendalian kebijakan*. PT Alex Media Komputindo.
- Nurdin, I. (2017). *Etika Pemerintahan: Norma, Konsep, dan Praktek bagi Penyelenggara Pemerintahan*. Lintang Rasi Aksara Books.
- Papua Today. (2017, March 30). Selama Otsus Papua, Pemerintah Kucurkan Dana Rp 59,51 T. *Papua Today*.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2020). *Governance, politics and the state*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Santoso, P. (2014). *Analisis kebijakan publik*. Research Center for Politic and Government.