

# The Role of the Barisan Merah and Putih in Fighting for Legislative Member for Indigenous Papuans

Ode Jamal

Program study of Pancasila and Civic Education  
Cenderawasih University  
Jayapura City, Indonesia  
ode\_jamal@ymail.com

**Abstract--**This article explains the role of the Barisan Merah and Putih (BMP) organization in fighting for legislative members for indigenous Papuans in the Papuan People's Representative Council (DPRP), as mandated in the Papua special autonomy law. Legislative member for indigenous Papuans who are an affirmative policy, against the background of the low representation of Papuans in government. This paper aims to understand: (1) the background of affirmative seats in the Papua Province legislative body and the presence of the BMP; (2) the interests of the BMP organization towards the quota of legislative members for indigenous Papuans in the DPRP. In this paper, the approach used refers to the type of qualitative research with the case method. Data is based on literature and in-depth interviews with key informants. The results of the study concluded that: (1) the existence of seats for the affirmation of DPRP members was based on the low representation of indigenous Papuans in government, especially in the legislative body. Meanwhile, the controversy between the political elite, society and the government caused the realization of the aforementioned legislative seat to be affirmed, prompting BMP to struggle for it; (2) BMP's interest in fighting for the affirmation seat, in addition to increasing the representation of indigenous Papuans in the DPRP, an interest in political power but also as a pro party to the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia in balancing the strong aspirations of disintegration in Papua.

**Keywords:** *BMP, indigenous Papuans, parliament*

## I. INTRODUCTION

The main focus of the problem in this study, concerns the controversy and difficulty of the realization of additional quota (one-quarter) legislative members for Papuans (OAP) in the Papuan People's Representative Council (DPRP). This problem has become a local political issue in Papua since the 2004, 2009 elections to the 2014 election. Additional seat quota  $\frac{1}{4}$  (one-quarter) legislative member in the DPR-Papua institution, is one of the affirmative content for indigenous Papuans, which is regulated in the Act Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Province of Papua (Papua Otsus). In Article 6 Paragraph (2) of the Special Autonomy Law, it is stated that the DPR-Papua consists of members who are elected and appointed based on statutory regulations.

The affirmation chair quota for the OAP has not yet attracted the attention of the BMP organization. This organization, often present when there is political turmoil in Papua, especially responds to the aspirations of disintegration. This organization was born with the spirit of maintaining Papua in the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). On the other hand, when the strong aspirations of independent Papua, the BMP wanted to fight for the affirmation seat during the 2009 elections. BMP gave a view, so that the affirmation seat was filled by OAP who had integrity towards the Republic of Indonesia. The attitude of the BMP is considered by some in Papua as the "accomplices" of the state".

BMP will make a number of lobbies to actors or political elites at local or central levels. The struggle gained support when the claim of BMP to Article 6 Paragraph (2) was approved by Mahkamah Konstitusi (MK) in 2009. MK instructed that the local government and DPRP of Papua Province developed a regulation of the additional rekrutmen of additional legislative members for the native people of Papua. However, some political elites in Papua questioned the motivation of BMP as a non-state grup.

## II. THEORETICAL REVIEW

In analyzing the role of the BMP organization in struggle for members of the DPRP for indigenous Papuans, there are two main theories used. First, is the theory of interest groups and second, the theory of neopatrimonial states. According to John T. Isyama and Marijke Breuning, interest groups are private organizations that seek to influence public policy and the behavior of political decision makers [1]. Gabriel A. Almond, in Sagita has previously divided interest groups into four groups, namely anomic groups, non-associational groups, institutional groups, and associational groups. [2]

In giving its influence, according to Heywood, interest groups have a variety of political tactics and strategies. Heywood added that the interest group's character and resources greatly influenced its political strategy. These resources include: (1) public sympathy for the group and its objectives; (2) size of membership or activity base; (3) financial strength and organizational capability; (4) the ability to influence the government; (5) personal or

institutional relations that may have with political parties or government bodies [3].

According to Meriam Budiardjo, the tactic that is always used by interest groups is to continuously interact with the executive body. How to work as many interest groups as possible without pressure or coercion, but through lobbying and networking that is intensive but persuasive. But if this method is less successful, they will not hesitate to act harder by taking direct action, which sometimes ends in violence [4]. The neopatrimonial theory as the second theory used in this study. Described by James C. Scott and Maswadi Rauf, to show the patron-client relationship [5], the patronage network established by the BMP organization. The pattern of relations, where BMP by making certain military officials and political elites, or nationalist figures as its patron. This is intended by BMP to have an impact as a capital of the strength of BMP's political network in fighting for the realization of the quota  $\frac{1}{4}$  (a quarter) of DPRP members for OAP.

### III. RESEARCH METHOD

This paper refers to the type of qualitative research. This type of research is defined as a process of inquiry to understand social problems, based on the creation of a holistic picture formed with words, reporting the views of informants in detail, and arranged in a natural setting [6], [7]. In obtaining information, the case study method is used. This method leads researchers to enter the smallest social units and as an effort to examine social problems or phenomena that are contemporary [8]. In this context, case studies are focused on the role of the BMP organization in fighting for the realization of the DPRP member affirmation seat quota for indigenous Papuans. Data obtained from informant sources through two ways: first, the study of literature in the form of literature (books, documents, articles, reports, newspapers, etc.), which is relevant to the research problem [9]. Second, in-depth interviews, where data were collected through interviews with key informants, the main sources of informants came from: BMP Organization, Papua Regional Government, DPRP, MRP, Academics, NGOs, community leaders, and Papua Provincial KPU. Data analysis refers to the Huberman and Miles model, in the form of a cycle, which consists of data reduction, data display, and resolution drawing and verification [8].

### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 1. Background of BMP in Papua-Indonesia

The formation of the BMP organization in Papua is strongly suspected to be related to the stronger aspirations of the disintegration of the nation in Papua. The rise of the 'Bintang Kejora' flag and the approval of the rolling reforms in 1998, seized the attention of the current government. The condition, by the state through the military then led to support groups for againts the independent pro-Papua groups. Like red and white organizations in other regions in Indonesia, BMP Papua also has a goal as an interest organization that also maintains the sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia. [10]

The political situation in Papua, among others, was also described by Jaap Timer in his study entitled, *Decentralization of the Kapra and Elite Politics* in Papua [11]. According to him, after the fall of Suharto in 1998 and the presidency was handed over to the Vice President, B.J. Habibie, a spirit of "democratic reform" engulfed the entire archipelago. In Papua, the spirit resulted in *Papuan Spring*, when the leaders of Papua carefully balance the representations of the beaches and mountains involved in the national action and establishment of organization-organization of Papua. In mass meetings, there was heating debates about the history of Papua and the future of Papua (autonomous or independent). The Papuan Spring changed to the movement of the native people of Papua who claimed for independence from Indonesia.

Being actively involved in the formulation of the Law of Special Autonomy for Papua, Agus Samule revealed that the peak of political movement of the people of Papua was the Congress of Papua II. According to Agus Samule, after the collapse of New Order regime, from December 1999 to 2000, there were a number of important politic activities in Papua. Among others was the ceremony to fly the flag Bintang Fajar on 1 December 1999, Congress of Papua on 26 February 2000, and Congress of Papua II 29 from Mei to 4 June 2000 [12].

In the stronger aspiration for disintegration through the independence movement of the people of Papua in the reformation era in Indonesia, the military forces and pro-integration civilian militias wanted to maintain Papua in the unitary state of Indonesia. The second Group includes the organization of BMP in Papua. However, a number of sources revealed that the history of establishment of BMP in Papua possibly is related to the stronger aspiration for independence among the people of Papua. To respond the situation the state through the military force establishes pro-integration groups to stand against the pro-independence group in Papua. The flying of the flag 'Bintang Kejora' and demand for independence after the reformation 1998 have made the government and the military force worried.

In such political incidences in Papua, a number of people in Papua suspected that this group is supported by the state through the military force. A local media of Papua reveals that in response to the aspiration for independence by the people of Papua there were counter statements by the groups affiliated to the New Order regime. On 3 July 1998 the Chairman of *Gerakan Merah Putih*, Saul Yenu claimed that since the Act of Self Determination (Pepera) 1969 Irian Jaya has been the part of Indonesia. On 7 July 1998, the Legiun Veteran Republik Indonesia (Indonesian Veteran Legion) in front of the Dandim (District Military Commander) 1701 Jayapura condemned the separatist groups and declared to be armed again to eradicate separatism

In the interview with the Secretary General of BMP organization [13] and Wawan Purwanto [14] said, "One of the motivations of the establishment of BMP in Papua is that it is medium to support the policies of the state, particularly in the development of nationalism and NKRI." According the Registration Certificate in the Directorate General of Political

and National Unity Service stated that BMP was registered as a civil organization. Although it was actually established on 13 February 2006, it was formally registered on 6 January 2009. BMP organization is an organization that comprises the combination of groups of fighters of Irian Barat (Papua) liberation. They are Indonesian Irian Youth Movement (GAPII), Red and White Movement (GMP), Council for the Determination of the Liberation of West Irian (Council for the Determination PEPERA/ DMP), People's Three Command (TriKora), West Irian Veteran Organization, and West Irian Diplomatic Veteran Group in the United Nations. The groups have declared that integration of Papua to the unitary state of Indonesia is final and thus they want to maintain the unity of Indonesia.

When studying the politic conflict in Papua, Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (LIPI) found that in political arena, social factors involved in the conflict in Papua can be identified based on the political interest of the independence of Papua. Results of LIPI's study show that they consist of pro-independence groups (MS= Merah Sekali or Totally Red), Pro-NKRI (BS= Biru Sekali or Totally Blue) and middle groups (Merah Muda (Light Red), Biru Muda (Light Blue), or Merah Biru (Red Blue). In the classification of actor by LIPI, Barisan Merah Putih is identified as the Pro NKRI group (BS = Biru Sekali) [15].

The background of BMP establishment was once told by another expert of Papua. For example, Amirudin Al Rahap explains that political arena in Papua consists of two types of habitat. They are the habitat of people who hold formal position under the sense of Indonesian and the habitat who struggled for the sense of Papua. The two were in conflicting positions. According to Amirudin Al Rahap, Decky N. Pigay describes the two habitats in the metaphor of "Cenderawasih" for the people who are in confrontation and "Matoa" for the people who are in collaboration with the central government [16].

According to Decky N. Pigay, as cited by Amirudin Al Rahap, in daily political practice, "Cenderawasih" and "Matoa" are connected with political intertwining changes due to the pragmatic political interest. In the habitat of Cenderawasih, there are three layers of attitude. The first layer is "independence" 100%. The second layer is independence by diplomacy and the third is the floating group who will likely to favor independence when there is an opportunity. This habitat also includes the guerilla combatants in forests and the people who have demonstration in urban areas in Indonesia and overseas. The symbol that they use is *merdeka* (M) or independence.

Meanwhile the habitat of "Matoa" also consists of three layers. The first layer is "NKRI 100%. The second layer is "remains in NKRI by diplomacy" the third is "lack of pro-NKRI attitude, but when there is an opportunity, they will join NKRI". The attitude of Matoa group depends on the attitude of the central government. In Papua, it is determined by the *Kodam* (Regional Military Command) and *Korem* (Resort Military Command). The attitude of this group among others can be seen in Ramses Ohee, the founder of *Paguyuban Pejuang Pembebasan Irian Barat*. He declared,

"BintangKejora is not the cultural symbol of the traditional people of Papua". BintangKejora, according to Ohee, is only used by a group of people as the symbol of separatism, thus it cannot be used as the local symbol.

To show the support to the integration of Papua to NKRI, on 1 December 2008 BMP declared officially to challenge the groups that want independence of Papua. For example the demonstration that aspired the independence of Papua led by BuktarTabuni in Waena-Ekspo Jayapura and the campus of UniversitasCenderawasih in 2008, was challenged by BMP. BMP also protest the *Presidium Dewan Papua* (PDP) in the joint prayer in the home of the late Theys Hiyo Eluay on 1 December 2008 since it was considered to ignite aspiration of Papua's independence. According to Ramses Ohee, Papua in NKRI is already final. Therefore, BMP condemned PDP, and asked Indonesian Armed Forces and Indonesian Police to investigate Toam Benal and Thoha Al Hamid as the central figures of PDP since it was considered a subservice action [17].

## 2. Quota of Special Chairs for DPRP Members and Interest of Barisan Merah Putih

A definition of interest group is described by Janda Berry and Golman in Ishiyama and M. Breuning [1]. They experts revealed that interest groups are the organized groups with common objective that actively influence the government. They also concluded that interest groups are private organizations that influence public interest and influence behavior of political decision makers. The theory of interest groups proposed by the experts does not merely provide definition, but in this study it will be related to the emergence of BMP organization Papua Province in influencing the additional quota of  $\frac{1}{4}$  (one fourths) of DPRP for native people of Papua [1].

Low representation of native people of Papua in governmental bodies of executive and legislative in New Order regime has become the main reason of demand for additional  $\frac{1}{4}$  (one fourths) members of DPRP for the native people of Papua. As an academician at Universitas Cenderawasih and member of team assistance in the formulation of the Draft of Special Autonomy Law for Papua Province, Muhammad Abud Musa'ad explains the background of the additional  $\frac{1}{4}$  (one fourths) for chairs in DPRP. According to Musa'ad, actually the additional chairs are based on the Draft of Special Autonomy for Papua proposed by the assistance team after the survey in 2001 in the local parliaments (DPRD district/city and DPRD Province) in Papua. It was found that the number of members of local parliaments elected in the general election of 1999 was only 46 %. It implies that 54% of members of local parliaments in Papua are not native people of Papua ("outsiders") [18].

To justify the statements we can see results of survey conducted by the assistance team on table. This table compares the proportion of native people of Papua in local parliaments in Papua in 2001:

Table 1: Percentase of native people of Papua and women in local parliament in Papua- election 1999

Province/Kabupaten/Kota	Native people of Papua (%)	Women %
1	2	3
Province	46	6,6
Jayapura City	47	0
Jayapura District	47	8
Biak Numfor District	48	4
Merauke Dustrict	50	3,3
Manokwari District	52	8
Sorong District	36	4
Fak-Fak District	68	0
YapenWaropen Distric	50	0
Jayawijaya Distric	75	0
Nabire Distric	76	8
Puncak Jaya District	76	8
Mimika District	52	0
Paniai District	92	0

Source: Musa'ad, 2012 : 100.

Based on the finding, according to Musa'ad the assistance team concluded that to create balance in local parliaments, it is necessary to have special strategies. Therefore, the assistance team formulated three (three) scenarios. First, it is necessary to have special chair quota for native people of Papua in DPRP, which was later based on the law determined to be additional  $\frac{1}{4}$  chairs out of the chairs contested by the political parties based on the Law of General election. Second, it is necessary to have protection to the native people of Papua through the establishment of special representatives who are authorized to protect the rights of the native people of Papua. This is the basis of the establishment of MRP. Third, it is necessary to accommodate the native people of Papua in the political selection and recruitment by political parties. This is the basis of the issuance of article 28 paragraphs (3) and (4) in the Law of Special Autonomy for Papua.

### 3. Special Autonomy Chairs and BMP Interest for Traditional Community

Although the policy of Special Autonomy for Papuan Province has been protested since the initial phase, however for some people, this policy is expected to bring changes for the native people of Papua. Expectations come from the traditional community of Papua. They are recognized and acknowledged in the implementation of Special Autonomy policy. This is clearly seen in the Article 1 paragraph (p) of the Law of Special Autonomy for Papua, where traditional community may be engaged in political space.

Historically, traditional community group in Papua has been attached to the culture and traditions. In such a condition, the traditional figures are needed to reserve the traditional values and sustain the traditional groups. In the *Act of Self-Determination 1969* a number of traditional figures in Papua, (tribe heads) have contributed to represent the traditional groups in the support and integration of Papua to NKRI [19].

Under the Soeharto's administration of New Order, traditional groups of Papua as the part of Indonesia did not received the expected attention. The position of traditional community was neglected. Sometimes, the people were powerless under the pressure of the military force. The environment where they live was endangered, and their traditional lands were forcefully devoted to capitals supported by the military force. For example, Amungme tribe and Kamoro tribe in Timika District are threatened in their own land where PT Freeport Indonesia operates. When the Law of Special Autonomy for Papua was issued, the affirmation policy for traditional community of the native people of Papua was expected to result in better condition although some people doubted about it. The appreciation was manifested in the establishment of cultural body of Papua People's Assambly (MRP) and additional chair quota for members of traditional community of Papua in DPRP.

Different from MRP, which was only approved in 2004, the additional chair quota of members of DPRP for the native people of Papua was delayed. Three general elections of 2004, 2009, and 2014 in Indonesia, including in Papua Province have not resulted in the expected outcome. However, optimism among some people has made them insist the realization of the affirmation policy and give power to traditional groups in the making of important decisions as mandated in the Special Autonomy for Papua.

According Yoram Wambrauw [20], the Vice Chairman II of MRP said, "For me, special quota for the native people of Papua in legislative through assignment has to be realized. Although some people think that appointment is no longer relevant, but for me it is wrong since factually members of DPRD Jayapura City or Jayapura District, and in other mountainous regions, the number of members of DPRD from the native people of Papua has not significantly increased. For me, there two reasons of why special quota for native people of Papua in DPRP is needed. First, the number of constituent/voters of native people of Papua is numerically low, and it will be difficult for them to contest the chairs in DPRP and DPRD district/city. Second, the native people of Papua generally have poor welfare and income. When they have to enter political parties for candidacy, they will not be able to afford the political cost."

Due to the delayed realization of special chairs of members of DPRP for the native people of Papua, doubted emerged among the people. They are particularly the traditional community group in Papua Province. For the traditional community group, the delayed realization of additional affirmation chair will lead the political parties to take over the chairs like in the general election 2004 and 2009. Traditional leaders were also jealous that the special chairs for the Special Autonomy in the Province of Papua Barat (previously known as the Province of Irian Jaya Barat) has been realized since the general election 2009 and 2014. The chairperson of the Papua Indigenous Peoples Empowerment Institute (LPMAPI) Stevanus Siep said "When will the 14 chairs be discussed and socialized to the traditional community [21]."

In response to the unrest, deriving from the delayed realization of special chairs of members of DPRP for the native people or traditional group of Papua, BMP organization finally decided to struggle for it. In this context, BMP proposed a judicial review to Constitutional Court (MK) for the accommodation of public rights of the traditional community of Papua in 2009. Chairperson of BMP, Ramses Ohee said, “The Law of 21 according to us signifies the acknowledgement of Republic of Indonesia to Papua, Sir. Papua is the traditional land and traditional people live on it. According to the Law of 21 Papua is part of the unitary state of NKRI. Therefore, it is in the system to determine the future together for the prosperity and welfare of this region, Sir. That is what the Law of 21 article 6 paragraph (2) says. They are elected and appointed. We are the traditional people should be appointed, Sir. We hold the traditional right for the traditional lands there.

In response to the statement of the chairperson of BMP, Constitutional Court made a decision of 116/PUU-VII/2009 stating, “Ramses Ohee is also the traditional figure (Big Ondoafi) of Heram-Waena Jayapura. He lives in the traditional-law community in Jayapura and is a veteran of Pepera who is still alive. Currently, his constitutional rights for the appointment in the special chairs of DPRP have been violated since the reserved rights have been taken by the political parties”, (SK Makamah Konstitusi, 2009).

Additional special chairs of members of DPRP through appointment are the constitutional rights of traditional community group. This is still frequently debated by some of the people of Papua since in the Special Autonomy for Papua, the rights of traditional community has been respected and acknowledged. They can participate in MRP. On the other hand, to prove that the struggle is motivated by the interest of traditional community, BMP has played the role together with the community groups. Frequently, BMP claims to be acting on behalf of the traditional community groups in Papua.

The advocacy of BMP organization for the public interest of the traditional community is said by the leaders of BMP such as Ramses Ohee the chairperson of BMP, and Yonas Alfons Nusi, the Secretary General of BMP. Nusi in the verdict of MK reveals, “Confiscation of membership in DPRP through appointment system by political parties has inhibited the rights of traditional community to be appointed as the members of DPRP. Their efforts to claim for the collective right and participation in the planning, supervising, and implementing of development in Papua have become difficult”.

#### 4. Chairs in Special Autonomy and BMP Interest in NKRI

According Bernada Meteray [22] Papua, although has become the legally acknowledged part of NKRI since the New York Agreement 1962 and the Referendum in 1969, has been claimed to be an independent state. Solossa [23] former Governor of Papua Province, said that although there is an international acknowledgment of the integration of Papua to NKRI, disintegration in Papua has not fully been resolved. Solossa added that a number of factors contribute to the unrest. The first factor is prolonged political dispute between

Indonesia and the Dutch on Papua for 18 years (1945-1963). The second factor is extreme economic discrepancy between Papua as one of the largest contributor to the state’s finance and other regions in Indonesia. The third is relatively low quality of people’s social-economic life in Papua, particularly the native people of Papua. The fourth is serious human right violations in Papua.

Meanwhile, Muridan S. Widjojo [15] concluded that conflict in Papua results from different factors. They are historical integration of Papua in NKRI, political violence and Human Rights abuse, development failure, and inconsistent policy of Special Autonomy and marginalization of people of Papua. Widjojo explained that historically, interpretation of history of integration, political status, and political identity of Papua results from the political competition in the decolonization of Papua. Political violence and development failure are the implication of the authoritarianism during the New Order. Meanwhile, inconsistency of the government in implementation of special autonomy was another problem after the collapse of the New Order.

Referring to Solossa and Widjojo, et al, it can be concluded that absolute sovereignty of NKRI and therefore, some factors may contribute. Affirmation in the Law of Special Autonomy for Papua implies this condition. In this context, delayed realization of additional chairs for special members of DPRP for the native people of Papua may open contestation among the parties. The government (state) requires that the chairs in Special Autonomy be filled up by the nationalists such as BMP, to ensure effective collaboration of peace development in Papua. For example, the integration issues in Special Autonomy have led to the difficult agreement on the establishment of MRP and acknowledgement of local symbol. About the establishment of MRP, according to Chauvel and Bhakti (2004) in Jaap Timer said, that Department of Home Affairs delayed the establishment of MRP since the officials in Jakarta that the power extended to the people of Papua may threaten the stability in Papua [11]. Meanwhile, the people in Papua started to question if the Special Autonomy will be just ‘nonsense’ from ‘Jakarta’. Other people still hope that with the support and pressure from foreign government and international NGO, Jakarta will finally agree on the establishment of MRP in Papua.

While in the second case, the strategic issue in special autonomy for Papua that results in the pros and cons between the Central Government and Papua is the use of local symbols. According to Muridan S. Widjojo [15], both MRP and the central government realize conflict of interpretation of the symbols used by the native people of Papua. In 2007, MRP prepared draft of concerning the use of local symbols of Papua Province. Principally MRP wanted to adopt the whole aspiration of the people of Papua to use *Bintang Kejora* as the flag of the province, *Hai Tanahku Papua* as the anthem of the province, and Mambruk Bird and the motto *One People One Soul* as the symbol and motto of the province. MRP argues that the symbols represent local identity and Papua remains the part of Indonesia.

On the contrary, the central government had different interpretation. They perceived the use of symbols of Papua such as *Bintang Kejora*, *Hai Tanah ku Papua*, and Mambruk Bird as the symbols that represent separatism. By adopting the symbol, the nationalists of Papua would have a chance to prepare the independence of Papua. Consequently, while the draft of local symbols of Papua Province had not been discussed, in December 2007 the central government issued the PP 77/2007 prohibiting the use of the symbols that resembles the symbols used by separatist groups.

The interest of the state and the military force is to keep the peace in Papua in the unitary state of NKRI. Therefore, it is understandable that the government wanted to reserve the special chairs in DPRP for the native people of Papua. Among other issues, the issue of Special Autonomy concerning the quota of chairs in DPRP recruited by appointment is a serious concern. The central government was afraid that the reserved chairs are occupied by the people who strengthen the aspiration of independence through their political power in DPRP. The government has interpreted the controversy of provincial symbols proposed by MRP differently. The central government expects that the native people of Papua who support the integration of Papua to NKRI occupy the reserved special chairs in DPRP. In the claim to MK, BMP raised the issue of reserved chairs in the Special Autonomy. BMP asked that the native people who had good integrity occupy the chairs. The cautious policy of the central government in the issue of chairs in Special Autonomy was finally proven. In 2015, the government through the Minister of Home Affairs issued a decision, concerning the review of the "Special Local Regulation of 6 / 2014 concerning the Membership of Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Papua Recruited through Appointment for the Period of 2014-2019". The letter of the Minister of Home Affairs addressed to the MRP, DPRP and Governor of Papua Province required the review of the local regulation. Although it did not specifically required that the special chairs in DPRP were reserved for the people of BMP it is interesting to know that the Minister's letter was based on the information received by mail or by interview with NGOs such as Central Board of BMP and Forum Komunikasi Masyarakat Adat Papua Bersatu.

In response to the government's decision, Yoram Wambrauw the Vice President II of MRP said that politically the central government was hesitated about the occupation of the chairs in Special Autonomy. The central government politically worried that the people who are influenced by political power for independence would occupy the additional quota of special chairs. This endangers the state integrity. Theoretically, the suspicion of elite of Papua to the state intervention in political recruitment can be illustrated by Malloy's theory of corporate state in Anna Batta. In corporate state according to Malloy, state's power controls the system, including the recruitment of political leaders. Essentially, the state decides which units allowed to participate in a system, and the state strictly controls the leader selection of the individual units. In corporate perspective, the state specially provide benefits, such as fixed job, to the people from different sector [1].

As expected by the state, BMP urged that the quota of special chairs of members of DPRP be reserved for the native people of Papua who support the integration of Papua to NKRI. Therefore, BMP expected that quota of special chairs of members of DPRP are reserved by the figures or elite of native people of Papua who are truly nationalistic to balance the opposition of members of DPRP who consistently disagree on the integration of Papua to NKRI. In Constitutional Court in 2009, Ramses Ohee said that "...since what BMP raised is for the unity of the nation and state, eternal, nobody disturb it, Sir. So..I am already old, Sir. I cannot keep fighting, Sir. I hope that we come together to see... and I will inform this to all, tell to the people that you are ready to help Papua in allocating the 11 chairs and 9 chairs in Papua land" [24].

Yonas Nussy, the Secretary General of BMP Papua Province stated almost similarly in the Constitutional Court (MK) in 2009. Nussy said that BMP as organization that cares for the integration and unity of NKRI feel that the constitutional rights have been violated, since the recruitment of the members of DPRP should be reserved for the traditional representatives rather than representatives of political parties. According to Nussy, the occupation of the chairs of members of DPRP supposedly for the native people of Papua by the representatives of political parties is the violence to the rights of Traditional Representatives of Papua. Unless this is resolved wisely, it may result in conflict between the separatist groups and pro-integration group. In response to Nussy's application for judicial review of Article 6 Paragraph (2) of the Law of Special Autonomy for Papua, Constitutional Court acknowledged that Nussy had legal standing. According to Constitutional Court, BMP struggled that the pro-integration traditional representative of Papua could be appointed as the members of DPRP to balance the other group that expects independence.

On returning to Papua, after the decision of MK in 2009, BMP told the people about the legislative chairs for the native people of Papua. BMP claims that MK approved the judicial review since there was a kind of "*bargaining politic*" to the empowerment of NKRI through the additional chairs of ¼ (one fourths) in DPRP. The Secretary General of BMP Yonas A. Nussy said "Frankly we cannot give this opportunity to the persons that you don't know, that we don't cultivate them, it's very dangerous, how to keep the stability of NKRI, that's our bargaining position to keep the unity of NKRI". State intervention in affirmation policy mandated in the Law of Special Autonomy for Papua has been practiced in the recruitment of members of MRP. A number of researchers on Papua said that in practice the recruitment of members of MRP is fully controlled by the Department of Home Affairs and the Provincial Directorate of National Unity, particularly when it is related to the committee of recruitment and supervision. The National Unity at Province and District levels and even down to the village level controls the process [25].

##### 5. Chairs of Special Autonomy and Tendency of Power Source for BMP

Muhammad Imawan, dalam penelitiannya, menyebutkan, bahwa kelompok kepentingan salah satu

tujuannya adalah memberikan peluang bagi anggotanya untuk berpartisipasi dalam proses politik. Menimal menyangkut satu isu tertentu, anggota-anggotanya dapat terlibat dalam mempengaruhi pejabat pemerintah. [26]. Referring to Imawan's opinion, we can conclude that the appearance of BMP organization in the struggle for the realization of additional chairs in DPRD for the native people of Papua was weakly associated to pursue of power. However, for some people of Papua, BMP is approaching the power. Timotius Murib the President of MRP in Papua Province said that BMP has its own interest. According to Timotius Murib, so far BMP is the most militant group that urges the realization of additional chairs in DPRD for the native people of Papua.

Timotius Murib said, "As the traditional chairman, I strongly disagree with the additional 14 chairs. Since the leadership of Barnabas Suebu, we have disagreed. In Special Autonomy legislative is mostly occupied by outsiders," Murib said, "the 14 Chairs are for position seekers. However, it has been put in the local gazette so that we support it. Currently majority of members of DPRD are native people of Papua. Therefore, additional 14 chairs are no longer necessary. Talking about the basic rights of the native people of Papua, they have been accommodated in MRP, while political rights are accommodated in DPRD by political parties" [27].

BMP realized the difficulty in the occupation of the additional chairs of Special Autonomy. Therefore, while avoiding public suspicion that BMP was seeking a power, BMP hide the interest. BMP claimed that it merely struggle for the constitutional rights of the traditional community. At the same time, when coming to the nationalists, BMP argued that affirmative chair could be used by the state to appoint the native people of Papua who had strong nationalism. When asked about the power seeking through the chairs in DPRD for the native people of Papua, in an interview Yonas Nussy [12] said, "We don't have any tendency to secure a power from our struggle. However, when we have to hold the responsibility, I am ready to be appointed to the chairs in DPRD reserved for the native people of Papua".

Chairperson of BMP Ramses Ohee when interviewed in his home said, "Of the 14 chairs regulated in the Local Regulation of 6 / 2014 only 13 chairs are contested by all elements of native people of Papua. They have agreed that one chair is reserved for me as the appreciation for what I have done in MK. I've got information from the provincial government and the Political and National Unity Office that the governor has agreed to reserve 1 chair for me." About a number of BMP leaders who had the same interest to reserve the chairs in DPRD for native people of Papua, in an interview Ramses Ohee (2016) said that: "Yes, I have got information from there (traditional area of Saireri), that Yonas Nussy and Hemsker ke Bonay are in contestation, candidates there. ... I told them to take part in the competition, the selection committee is all people of Papua, and they have known who have struggle for the chairs. I hope they are successful, I pray" [28].

The implementation of strengthening character education at Alfa Centauri Bandung High School has gone well; it can be seen from the many school programs that lead to the process of character education. But in its implementation it still faces various obstacles that come from outside the school and from within the school itself. The implementation of strengthening character education at Alfa Centauri High School in Bandung can be seen from the enactment of the moral curriculum that is typical of these high schools. In its implementation, there are various obstacles, namely the difficulty of making synergies between schools and parents, the location of schools that are divided, and the difficulty of schools in monitoring children's behavior in their social media. While the solution offered by schools to overcome the obstacles faced is to make special meetings with parents to discuss all matters relating to children, hold teacher and school meetings, and optimize Civics subjects as direct subjects related to student behavior.

## V. CONCLUSION

In the midst of the controversy over the realization of legislative member affirmation seats for indigenous Papuans in the Provincial DPRD, the BMP organization emerged. The organization has an ideological base that always maintains the sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia. The interests of the BMP organization in fighting for the affirmative quota for legislative members are: first, it is in the context of increasing the involvement of indigenous Papuans, particularly indigenous peoples in government. BMP considers that the struggle is in accordance with the nature given special autonomy to Papua. Second, in fighting for the affirmative legislative seat, the BMP's interests cannot be separated from the desire to enter political power. This was proven when there were BMP leaders who became DPRD members from the affirmative chair. Third, as a nationalist group, which continues to support Papua in the Republic of Indonesia, BMP wants to fill the affirmative seat. This step can be seen from the BMP lobby to convince nationalists and the central government.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. T. Ishiyama and. M. Breuning, *Ilmu Politik Dalam Paradigma Abad ke-21: Sebuah Refrensi Panduan Tematis*. Book 1, Yogyakarta: Kencana Prenata Media Group, 2013.
- [2] N. I. Sagita, "Strategi Gerakan Kelompok Kepentingan dalam Pengawasan Pengendalian Pemanfaatan Ruang Kawasan Bandung Utara," *Wacana Politik*, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 98, 2016.
- [3] A. Heywood, *Politik*, Fourth Edition, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar, 2014.
- [4] M. Budihardjo, *Dasar - Dasar Ilmu Politik*, Revisi Edition, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Umum, 2013.
- [5] M. Rauf, *Konsensus Politik : Sebuah Penajagan Teoritis*, Jakarta: Dirjen Dikti Depertemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2001.
- [6] N. K. a. Y. S. L. Dezin, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Translated by Dariyatno, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2009.
- [7] J. W. Creswell, *Research Design : Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Translated by NurKhabibah, Jakarta: KIK Press, 2002.
- [8] B. Bungin, *Analisis Data Penelitian Kualitatif : Pemahaman Filosofis dan Metodologis ke Arah Penguasaan Model Aplikasi*, Jakarta: Raja Grafindo, 2003.

- [9] C. M. a. G. B. Rosman, *Designing Qualitative Research* (Second edition), Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, 1995.
- [10] A. W. Wardhani, "Peran YPKP sebagai Kelompok Kepentingan (Interest Group) dalam Memperjuangkan Hak-Hak Korban Peristiwa G30SPKI (Studi Kasus Aktivitas YPKP di Kabupaten Pati," *Politika*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 118, 2017.
- [11] J. Timer, *Desentralisasi Salah Kapra dan Politik Elit di Papua* in Henk Sculte Nordhot and Gerry van Klinken, (assisted by Ireen Karang-Hoogenboom), Jakarta: KITLV in Collaboration with Yayasan Obor Indonesia, 2007.
- [12] A. Samule, *Mencari Jalan Tengah: Otonomi Khusus Provinsi Papua*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2003.
- [13] Y. A. Nussy, Interviewee, *quota 14 chair for OAP*. [Interview]. Saturday March 2015.
- [14] W. Purwanto, *Papua 100 Tahun Ke Depan*, Jakarta: Cipta Mandiri Bangsa (CMB) Press, 2010.
- [15] M. S. Widjojo, *Papua Road MAP : Negotiating the past, improving the Present and Security the future*, Jakarta: Collaboration of LIPI, Yayasan TIFA, and Yayasan Obor Indonesia, 2009.
- [16] A. a. Rahap, *Heboh Papua: Perang Rahasia, Trauma and Separatisme*, Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu, 2010.
- [17] L. d. lamato, *Obat Demokarasi Papua Tafsir Ekstrim Atas Polemik and Isu Merdeka and NKRI*, Jayapura: Lakede Institute, 2010.
- [18] M. A. Musa'ad, *Qua Vadis Otonomi Khusus Papua : Diantara Tuntutan, Rekontruksidan Referendum*. Revised Edition, Yogyakarta: Thifa Media, 2012.
- [19] F. Numbery, *Quavadis Papua*, Jakarta: Bhuanal Ilmu Populer, 2014.
- [20] Y. Wambrauw, Interviewee, *Representasi Perwakilan OAP di DPRD*. [Interview]. Selasa Juni 2015.
- [21] S. Siep, Interviewee, *Quota 14 Chairs For OAP*. [Interview]. 1 November 2014.
- [22] B. Meteray, *Nasionalisme Ganda Orang Papua*, Jakarta: Kompas, 2012.
- [23] J. P. Salossa, *Otonomi Khusus Papua : Mengangkat Martabat Rakyat Papua di Dalam NKRI*, Jakarta: Pustaka Sianr Harapan, 2003.
- [24] M. Konstitusi, "SK Makamah Konstitusi Nomor". Indonesia Patent 116/PUU-VII/2009, 2009.
- [25] A. Ayorbaba, *The Papua Way : Dinamika Konflik Laten & Refleksi 10 Tahun Otonomi Khusus Papua*, Jayapura: Tabloid Suara Perempuan Papua, 2011.
- [26] M. Maiwan, "Kelompok kepentingan (interest group), Kekuasaan dan Kedudukannya dalam Sistem Politik," *Jurnal Ilmiah Mimbar Demokrasi*, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 82, 2016.
- [27] C. Pos, "The 14 Chairs are For Position Seekers," 21 Oktober 2015.
- [28] R. Ohee, Interviewee, *Quota 14 Chairs for OAP*. [Interview]. 1 August 2016.