



Prehistoric Trade in Papua, Indonesia

Erlin Novita Idje Djami¹ (✉) , Bau Men² , Rini Maryone² ,
and Klementin Fairyo² 

¹ Archaeologist at Research Center of Prehistoric and Historical Archaeological, BRIN, Kuala Lumpur, Indonesia

novita_idje@yahoo.co.id

² Archaeologist at Reseach Center of Environmental Archaeology, Maririme and Suatainable Culture, BRIN, Kuala Lumpur, Indonesia

Abstract. The study of prehistoric trading in the Papua region is very interesting to do. The existence of various kinds of artifacts found that were not sourced or not made in the Papua region, is thought to have existed as a result of past trading activities. Archaeological evidence shows that trade in the Southeast Asia - Pacific region has occurred since prehistoric times, namely the late Pleistocene to 3500 BP at the Bukit Tengkorak site, Sabah, Malaysia with evidence of obsidian findings from Talaud and also from Talasea in Melanesia. In Papua, based on the findings of sea shells at the Togece Cave site in the central highlands, it is clear that local exchanges have occurred since 6000 years ago. Then after the arrival of Austronesian speakers in the Papua region, exchanges became more widespread with various evidences down to historical times. In this paper we try to describe a number of archaeological data in the Papua region which are considered as evidence of past exchanges, starting from the Pre-Austronesian, Early Austronesian and Early Metal periods, as well as Ethnohistorical data and Ethnoarchaeological data as data used to describe a possibility of ways and forms of exchange that may have occurred in prehistoric times.

Keywords: Artifacts · Period · Trade · in Papua

1 Introduction

Talking about trade is a very interesting topic to discuss, because this activity is an important part of human life from time to time in order to fulfill various needs of life. Trade is an activity of exchanging goods or services or both based on mutual agreement and not because of coercion. Before money was discovered, in the past the exchange of goods was called barter, namely exchanging goods for goods, whereas in modern times trade was carried out by exchanging money, that each item was valued by a certain amount of money [1].

Trade is a specific activity, because it involves a series of activities in the production and distribution of goods [2]. Generally, traded goods can be in the form of agricultural products, mining products, or technological products. In addition, in a trading activity

other than merchandise and people, it also involves places or transaction locations and supporting transportation facilities used mainly for long-distance trade and or inter-island trade.

In this paper, we try to describe prehistoric trade in Papua. In this regard, this paper will use the terms trade and exchange interchangeably according to the context of the discussion, so that there is no difference in interpretation of the two terms. For this reason, it is necessary to understand in advance the meaning of the two terms referred to, namely that exchange is basically the essence of trade in the narrow sense because there is an economic element in it, while the exchange itself is broader in nature and does not always contain trade or economic elements, but also includes social elements even though it brings economic value impacts in it. Then there is also the term barter as a form of trade if there is economic value, but if it has no economic value then barter is included in the exchange section. Barter is generally carried out by two parties without using payment instruments such as money, and this barter system does not have a clear standard of value but is carried out by two parties who need each other and agree. In bartering, there is flexibility in its implementation, namely only exchanging the goods we have with the goods we want, but we still have to first find a party that needs the goods we have. Goods exchanged can be in the form of similar goods or goods of different types. Even though the financial value may be unbalanced or there is no standard value, each party involved usually agrees [3].

As trade or exchange is an important part of human life, what about the forms of trade that occurred in prehistoric times in Papua? This question arises because there are a number of foreign cultural artifacts found in the Papua region, and these artifacts were not produced by Papuans but came from outside Papua, and also the presence of artifacts from coastal areas in the interior of the mountains such as sea shells. The presence of these artifacts is then indicated as a result of an exchange or trading activity (between islands and between ethnicities on the large island of Papua) in the past. In addition, there is some archaeological data in the form of boat paintings on rock walls in Papua which are also indicated as a means of supporting transportation in an exchange activity in the past, but in this context without ruling out also an event of human migration at that time. The purpose of this writing is to provide an overview of an exchange or trading event in prehistoric times in Papua, bearing in mind that the ethnohistorical and ethnoarchaeological data of Papua illustrate that in Papua the patterns of human life are still reflected which characterize prehistoric culture. Besides that, it is also to invite the people of Papua to be involved in preserving cultural objects left behind from the past that are threatened with extinction due to changes and developments in the times.

2 Basic Idea of Study

The presence of a number of foreign artefacts at archaeological sites as well as artefacts kept by indigenous Papuans which incidentally do not originate from the region itself, is thought to exist as a result of exchange activities in the past. Exchange is one form of cultural interaction in the past. According to Daud Aris Tanudirjo (2011), in a process of cultural interaction in the past, there were three important data used, namely material culture, language, and genetics. The emergence of new material cultural elements or

certain artefact styles in a cultural system is often designated as evidence of intercultural interactions which then enter the cultural system, even borrowing words or changing languages and even genetic mixing occurs through marriage [4].

In the interaction of cultural exchange during the prehistoric period, material culture played a very important role, because it was the artifacts that were left that were then used as study material to reveal their origins and how they got to the archaeological site, the place where the artifacts were rediscovered. One of the data describing prehistoric trading is known from the results of research at the Bukit tengkorak site, Sabah, Malaysia which has found quite a lot of obsidian, which from radiocarbon dating results is dated between 4300–900 BC, meanwhile, from the results of material analysis, it is known that the obsidians are divided into three groups: group A matches obsidian from Talasea in New Britain, West Melanesia, while group B matches several obsidian artifacts from Talaud Island, and group C matches obsidian sources. On the Admiralty Islands. The presence of obsidian earlier than 1600 BC on Skull Hill suggests that advanced trade-seafaring networks could have existed in island Southeast Asia at least 2500 years before the Lapita period. This also opens up the possibility of an early trading system around 4300 BC between Southeast Asia and Melanesia [5].

Referring to the trade network, of course it will also involve the areas it passes, especially by looking at the distance traveled and the means of transportation it uses. Papua is one of the areas that are in this trade route or trajectory, of course it is possible that at that time this area also played an important role as a transit area, which also stimulated exchanges with the Papuan people, especially in terms of food ingredients and freshwater intake.

Obsidian is also found in Papua, but unfortunately it is not clear where it came from. In addition, the findings of artifacts from sea shells at the Togece Cave site (6000 BP) in the interior of the Central Highlands of Papua, are indicated as a result of past trade [6]. For this reason, it is necessary to disclose data that can be a source of information about past trade in Papua, whether it is local Papuan trade data or the result of contacts with the outside world which is supported by the strategic position of the island of Papua which is in the Southeast Asian shipping-trade routes. Pacific, and likewise after the entry of Austronesian influence in the Papua region which added to the vibrant exchanges in this region. To reveal the forms of prehistoric exchange in Papua, ethnohistorical data and Papuan ethnoarchaeological data will be used as data to help explain how the forms of prehistoric exchange occurred, bearing in mind that in the Papua region the description of life forms with prehistoric characteristics still persists today.

3 Materials and Methods

The data sources used in this paper are archaeological data, library data which includes theories, ethnohistorical data, and Papuan ethnographic data obtained from research results, observations, and interview results related to symptoms that are considered related to an exchange activity. Then elaborate on the ethnohistorical and ethnoarchaeological data they have by trying to identify exchange patterns based on models of reciprocity, redistribution, and market systems and their distribution patterns [7].

4 Data and Discussion

The exchanges that occurred in the Papua region can be grouped into several periods based on artifactual data, supporting people, and cultural developments that occur as follows:

4.1 Pre-Austronesian Exchange

The exchange of the Pre-Austronesian period here includes exchanges that occurred within the Melanesian community, especially before the arrival of the Austronesians. For example, the presence of artefacts of bivalve shells of the class Corbiculidae batissa at the Togece Cave site in Wamena, the Central Highlands of Papua, which date to 6000 BP [6]. The presence of these artifacts is indicated as evidence of cultural interaction between the mountain people and the people of the coast. The cultural interaction that is very likely to occur between the two is exchange. However, by looking at the distance between the coastal area and the mountainous area which is quite far away and with difficult topography, the exchange that occurred did not involve direct contact between the two groups, but had gone through a trade network that was long enough so that the artifacts finally reached the Central Highlands area of Papua.

Related to past exchanges in mountainous areas as in the folklore of the Dani people that their ancestors had trade relations with the Me people (Paniai people) in the west, that in ancient times the ancestors of the Me tribe had exchanged cypraea moneta shells (*mege*) with garden products, pigs, tobacco, and game products from the Dani tribe. This exchange took place in places that had been mutually agreed upon, with the signs indicating that an exchange would occur, namely smoke from a fire made at the location of the exchange. In this transaction there is no meeting between the seller and the buyer, but only the meeting between the goods and the goods, the person making the transaction after placing the goods to be exchanged then goes into hiding while paying attention to the location of the transaction and keeps the theft from happening. Because the cypraea moneta shells are so valuable for the people in the Central Highlands region of Papua, these shells serve as a medium of exchange (traditional money), with exchange rates based on age, shape and size, both those that function economically in buying and selling goods and those that social functions related to the payment of dowries and paying other customary fines.

In addition, within the scope of the Dani community in the Balim Valley, salt has also been exchanged for garden produce, meat, tobacco, and salt for cypraea moneta (*salleken*) shells. The exchange process occurs in a way that people who need salt will come directly to the location of the salt water source (*Iluagomo*) in Hitigima to make an exchange, they are the people of Yelelo village in Maima and the Yomote village community in Papugoba which is across the east Balim river, then the two this community group also conducted a follow-up salt exchange with communities living farther out in the Seima area of Kurima. The groups that do this barter are actually still in a kinship relationship, and this also makes it easy for them to make exchanges.

4.2 Early Austronesian Exchanges

The presence and influence of Austronesian speakers in the Papua region has added to the complexity of Papuan cultural objects. One of the characteristics of early Austronesian culture that can be found in the Papua region is pottery. Pottery is often found at archaeological sites in coastal areas and surrounding islands, but these artifacts are not found in the central mountainous region and in the southern coastal areas of Papua, such as in Merauke, Asmat and Mimika. This illustrates that the Austronesian influence at that time did not reach these areas. The presence of pottery artefacts in Papua is thought to be the result of past gifts or exchanges and also does not rule out migration events. The presence of Austronesian speakers in eastern Indonesia is estimated to be around 3500–3000 BP based on C-14 dating carried out at the Utamadi Site, Kayoa Island, North Maluku which is dated 3300 BP [8].

Meanwhile in Papua, based on dating data on sites containing pottery artifacts, it is known that the Karas Kaimana Cave site has the year 3330 BP and the Andarewa Cave site in Fakfak has the year 2030 BP [9], then at the Atiat Niche site in Tambrau, the Bird's Head area is dated 3030 BP [10], at the Pater Abidon 2 Cave site in the Ayau archipelago, Raja Ampat the year is 2220 BP [11], then at the Momorikotey site Kapotar Island, in the Nabire Moorish Archipelago the year is 2720 BP (Personal communication with Klementin Fairyo, 2022) at the Mount Srobu Site, Jayapura City the year is 1740 BP [12], and on the Yomokho Dondai site, Jayapura dated to 1323 BP (Personal communication with Hari Suroto, 2022). Apart from these sites, there are many other sites which contain early Austronesian cultural influences but have not been dated. The findings of pottery artifacts in the Papua region are only in the north coast, west coast, and a little to the south coast of Papua with the boundary in the Kaimana region.

The findings of pottery at these sites are generally not supported by the availability of natural resources for pottery production, so their presence is due to being imported from outside, which may at that time be used as goods that are bartered with garden produce, sea products or hunting results with local residents. Pottery findings in Papua when viewed from the decorative motifs, there are motifs of Southeast Asian influence and there are also motifs of Lapita Pacific cultural influence, so it can be assumed that in the past exchange activities that occurred did not only come from the Southeast Asian region but also from the Pacific region., given the strategic position of the Papua region which is in the shipping-trade route that connects the two regions.

4.3 Early Metal Exchange

Of course, the exchange of early metal mass cannot be separated from the existence of Austronesian speakers. Austronesian speakers are a human group that has a very wide expansion space, namely from Taiwan in the north to New Zealand in the south, Madagascar in the west to Easter Island in the east. [13]. With its more advanced shipping technology, it has resulted in the spread of many cultural products from one place to another through their intermediaries.

One of the areas that became the expansion area for Austronesian speakers was the Papua region, initially they introduced earthenware, then in their development they

introduced bronze tools and Indo-Pacific beads and glass bracelets. In Papua there are several sites where bronze tools from the Dongsong culture are found, such as bronze axes, funnel axes, spear heads, ax heads, and dagger handles in Kwadeware; funnel ax in Asei; bronze ax in Ajauw (Small Ifar); and ceremonial axes at Abar in the Lake Sentani Region, but also found in the Doreri area of Lake Ayamaru in the form of three tympanum bronze drums of type heger 1 made in North Vietnam before AD 250 [14] and [15]. After these objects were in the hands of the Papuan people, they then developed their function to become valuable items, namely as ancestral objects and as amulets such as the tympanum nekara in Ayamaru. Apart from the bronze tools, there are also glass beads and glass bracelets which are still used specifically by the Sentani people as a dowry. In addition, an iron tool was also found from inside the grave tombs as burial supplies at the Gunung Srobu site [16].

The presence of these objects in Papua is indicated as a result of exchanges in the past, which of course arrived in the Papua region through a fairly long exchange process, namely from one trader to another and then ended up in the hands of the Papuan people, who use them by giving them new functions different to these objects such as indopacific beads, glass bracelets and bronze axes as a means of paying dowry, for example, glass bracelets and bronze axes only apply specifically to the Ondofolo group, namely the highest social status in the Sentani tribe, while beads apply to all groups who add stone axes (tomako). Before the glass bracelet was known, what was used as a dowry was a shell bracelet exchanged between the Lake Sentani people and coastal people such as the Nafri people, the Yokari people and other tribes living in the northern coastal region. As for the Nafri and Engros-Tobati tribes in Youtefa Bay, their dowry is in the form of glass bracelets for the Ondoafi group, while glass beads are for all levels of society.

4.4 Ethnohistorical and Ethnographic Data

To illustrate how the forms or models of prehistoric exchange in Papua, ethnohistorical data and ethnoarchaeological data play a very important role, considering that the development of culture in the Papua region is quite slow and the life patterns of some Papuan ethnic groups still have prehistoric culture characteristics that we can witness to this day.

Ethnohistorical data that can be related to early exchange activities in Papua is that since the VIII century AD there has been a relationship between West Irian and Sriwijaya either directly or indirectly, as evidenced by the existence of birds from Irian brought by the envoy of King Sri Indrawarman from Sriwijaya to be presented to the Chinese emperor, then in the Nagarakertagama book by the poet Prapanca 1365 or the XIV century mentions several areas in Papua such as Wwanin or Onin (in Fakfak), Sran for Kowiai (in Kaimana) and Timur which shows that part of Papua is part of the Majapahit sovereign territory [17]. In fact, around the 14th century in the southwestern region of Papua, traders from Java had visited them looking for masoi bark, because the Javanese used this oil for traditional medicine and other benefits [18].

Then at the beginning of the 16th century the Biak Numfor people had established trade relations with outside areas such as with residents in the coastal areas of Cenderawasih Bay, the north coast of the Bird's Head, the Raja Ampat Islands and even with residents in the Maluku Islands [19]. The Biak Numfor people are Papuans who have a

very wide range of motion, apart from in the Papua region, they have even reached the Maluku islands and also to the Sulawesi and Java regions. The movement of the Biak people out is to trade and headhunt in order to fulfill their subsistence needs. Initially, the exchange of the Biak Numfor people only occurred within the scope of their tribe, but because of the necessities of life and the conditions of the Biak Island region which in certain seasons cannot fulfill all their necessities of life, so they have to carry out goods exchange relations (*manibob*) with other areas, other region. In addition, because all the objects desired as dowries for the Biak people are goods originating or produced from outside the region, such as pottery, ceramic plates, beads, and so on, therefore, the maritime culture they possess has ushered in they come to other remote areas to trade.

Besides that, the Biak people are also known as traders of iron tools which are produced by themselves in several places in Biak such as in Sowek, Bosnik, Ware, Samber and several other villages. The people from this village are known as iron smiths. With their expertise, they process iron into tools such as machetes, knives, spearheads, axes, bracelets, sago rings and others. These iron tools were then sold from village to village on the coast of the Biak Numfor Islands, and also to several villages outside Biak Island such as Woi, Pom, Serewan, Wandamen, Ron, Wasior, Onim Island, Fak-fak, Namatota, Seget and various islands in Raja Ampat and to South Halmahera, Seram and Lease Island. They also sailed north via Raja Ampat, Misol, Seram and continued north to reach Tidore and Ternate. While sailing eastward to Humboldt Bay via Rani, Woda, Kurudu Kadpuri, Bono, Mamberamo, Komamba, Armo, Sarmi, Demta, Depapre, Jayapura and several islands in the Pacific. This trade was carried out to produce food and objects that were considered valuable to be brought back to the Biak area, but during this voyage there were also Biak people who did not return but settled in the areas they visited and even married and settled there [20].

The Biak tribe is one of the tribes in Papua that does a lot of long-distance and inter-island trade. They have two types of ships that are used for long-distance travel, namely the Mansusu ship for war and the Wairon ship for trade. Their trading ships may not be boarded by women but only by men with the goods to be exchanged, because on this ship rituals have been carried out so that the voyage for trade will be successful. This shipping for trade was carried out to various islands and to the greater land area of Papua and even to the Maluku region, and the exchange activity was complete when all the goods exchanged had been used up and then returned bringing home all the goods exchanged which were generally of economic value to meet social needs in besides food.

Apart from that, in Mansinam in 1855 before the arrival of Europeans, in this area there was pottery production (*uren doreh*) carried out by the Numfor people, who then exchanged the pottery with people in the Wandamen coastal area, to the Biak Numfor Islands and to the coastal area of the bird's head even to the Raja Ampat islands [21]. Meanwhile, in the mountainous region, Veldkamp (1958) said that the Dani people in periods of peace would come to visit their enemies and even exchange pigs for other things [22]. Apart from that, during the expedition of Europeans to the central mountainous region of Papua, they exchanged iron axes for stone axes of inland people, and during the entry of the CAMA Mission (*The Christian And Missionary Alliance*) in the Balim Valley region, they also paid airfield workers using *Cypraea Moneta* shells (*salleken*).

Then exchange with the Timorese or the Uringup people in the Swart Valley of the central mountains of Papua, using shells (tinale) as a medium of exchange for goods such as tobacco, stones made of stone axes, stone ax heads, and pigs. Tinale is a high-value medium of exchange, 10 tinales can be exchanged for 1 pig (incident in 1923). In their daily lives, when they travel, they always equip themselves with rain protection made of pandan leaves (karokya), fire rope, bamboo knives, bone needles, stone axes, tobacco, bags and tinal [23].

In addition, the exchange for the Muyu people was in the form of garden produce and pigs which were exchanged for shells (ot), tobacco, stone axes, and jewelery items. This exchange is carried out by women and men, but men are more dominant. For them the valuable currency 'Ot' or kauri is that which is inherited from old ancestors, with certain conditions related to color, shape and size that they know very carefully. In addition, they also know the small exchange tool from the dog's canine teeth [24]. Meanwhile, the Kombai people in the interior of Merauke also know the instrument of exchange for shells (kauri) which also functions as a means of paying dowry, where 1 kauri alone can get a wife. Then the Marind people exchange sago with neighboring tribes to get stone axes as work tools [25].

For the Mimika people, the exchange takes place by letting people from neighboring tribes (Tarja people) come to collect sago in their area, who then give rewards in the form of tobacco and boats, while the Mimika people exchange with the Kapauku people from the mountains in the form of tobacco with fish, nets and woven goods, stone axe, stone knife and salt. They also exchanged iron tools with masohi wood, crocodile skin and birds of paradise with the Seram people and the Chinese. The Mimika people know a number of goods which, due to their price, function as a medium of exchange or a measure of price in a reciprocal relationship, and value for them is not the goods that must be obtained, but the services and work that transport them [26]. The Me/Kapauku people in the interior already know *Cypraea Moneta* (mege) shells as a medium of exchange with values based on size and shape. The price of goods is influenced by the amount of supply, supply and demand, but for the rich to show their wealth and generosity to gain influence and followers in society, they sell their wares at low prices. Merchandise includes livestock, tools, garden produce, and labor. This trade is generally carried out at certain times such as during pig parties. In addition to the exchange of shells, the exchange of goods for goods also takes place and the exchange of devotion from a prospective son-in-law who builds a house for the prospective in-laws to relieve the dowry. The Kapauku people also exchange between clans just like the Mimika people [27] and the Dani-Hubula people.

Then the May Brat people exchanged the bird's head in the form of an exchange for Timorese cloth called *bo*, the measure of the value of cloth is based on the age, quality and beauty of the cloth. When one person gives Timorese cloth to another, he is obliged to return another cloth of greater value, and for this the person receiving the *bo* will look for an exchange partner from the other group to get the *bo* that is of higher value so that he can repay the debt earlier and so on. Exchange with the May Brat people is not only the exchange of necessities, but to accumulate wealth, position and influence [28].

In the Sentani ethnic community, they recognize that there are three forms of exchange based on material needs, namely the exchange of food ingredients for food by

two parties who need each other, there is also an exchange of food ingredients such as sago, bananas and fish with technological equipment such as sago tools, wooden plates, and pottery containers (olomebe), and the third is related to demands for payment of customary fines as a result of an offense which can be in the form of land, daughter or son or both. The demand for a daughter's fine is very useful for uniting the relationship between men and women from generation to generation [29].

The Sentani people also barter with the Yokari people and the Genyem people by exchanging shell bracelets for sago and hunting animals. In the Sentani Lake area there is a hill in the Puai area which is the location for bartering between the Yoka people in the east and the Tutari people in the west, according to the story that the bartering process is carried out with a sign of fire smoke at the agreed location, then the tribe to whom it is intended will come to them bartering locations by bringing goods to be exchanged, in this exchange there is a meeting between the buyer and the seller, different from those in the mountains without a meeting between the seller and the buyer. In the Lake Sentani area there are also exchange events between the Abar people producing pottery (*sempe*) and the surrounding community, namely pottery being exchanged for stone axes and beads and some for foodstuffs. Whereas in the Ormu tribe they bartered stone ax materials and stone ax blades with the surrounding tribes including the Sentani tribe. The goods exchanged were in the form of groceries from gardens, hunting animals and marine products as well as equipment. When viewed from the value of the object being exchanged it looks not commensurate, but because there has been a mutual agreement, the barter exchange still occurs. In addition, because groups have been formed that agree to barter or as barter partners. This exchange can occur at mining sites for stone ax materials such as in Ormu Wari, and at production sites such as Abar village which is a center for pottery production and vice versa. This all happens because there is a need.

In paying the dowry for the Sentani tribe, the men have prepared dowry assets in the form of stone axes and beads (stone bracelets if it's an Ondofolo child) and the women have prepared tubers, sago tumang, vegetables, fish and pork for consumption. Leave it to the men. Likewise in the case of head payments in the Sentani community, the only difference lies in the target receiving, namely if the dowry will be received by the father's family from the woman's side, while paying the head is received by the mother's family from the deceased.

Likewise, dowry payments to the Biak people in the form of Chinese ceramic plates (*benbepon* or *resa-resa*) as main plates or head plates, Timorese cloth, beads, shell bracelets (*samfar*) or iron bracelets (*sarak*) are given by the male family. -the men to the women's family, then the women will provide groceries in the form of garden products such as bananas, coconut, petatas, tumang sago, taro, as well as fish, and pork to be brought home by the men's family. The same is true for head payments made by the male family to the female family (the family of the mother who gave birth). In the tradition of paying the dowry or paying the head, before it is carried out, of course, there must have been a meeting and agreement between the two parties first (Fig. 1).

Referring to the description of the exchange data above, it can be said that in Papua there are several exchange models encountered. If studied according to Renfrew and Bahn, there are several models found, namely the reciprocity model, namely exchanges that are reciprocal and unidirectional with exchanges that do not have to be equal, in this



Fig. 1. Artifacts which are goods exchanged in Papua

exchange the social element is quite dominant in it even though there is an economic element in it such as in the payment of a dowry. Then the redistribution model, namely the continued exchange from the first party to the second party which is then exchanged to the next party, maybe here there is an intermediary role (middleman) and the third model is the market exchange model, namely that the exchange is carried out in mutually agreed places, and there is bargaining in it until they reach a mutual agreement as in silent trade or exchange in face-to-face meetings at agreed places.

The pattern of distribution is that buyers come directly to the source of production to make exchanges, such as the Ormu people exchange stone tool materials for foodstuffs and also the Abar people exchange pottery with stone axes and beads. In addition, there are also those who come directly to the owner's house to exchange goods, such as the exchange of Timorese cloth. Exchanges can also occur due to a meeting in a certain place, such as the meeting of the mountain people with the Europeans who are on an expedition to the interior, namely the exchange of iron axes with stone axes. There are also exchanges in mutually agreed places such as the Dani-Hubula people and the Me people in exchange of shells for crops and hunting products, as well as the Kapauku people and the Mimika people in the form of garden produce for sea products and goods technology. Exchanges are also carried out at regional boundaries such as the Muyu people. Exchange also occurs through intermediaries although indirectly as in the exchange between mountain people and coastal people who have gone through a long process and network of exchanges, and there is also a one-way reciprocal exchange that crosses the area sequentially as done by the Biak people.

The forms of the exchange network are exchanges that occur within one ethnic group, exchanges between tribes, exchanges between coasts and inland, and exchanges between islands. Generally, goods exchanged from Papua are in the form of plantation products, game products, marine products, forest products, and technology goods. Products resulting from technology that are not sourced from the region in question generally have a certain position as valuables and are also used as a medium of exchange and even as a means of paying dowries and head payments. Both in coastal areas and surrounding islands as well as in mountainous interior areas.

5 Conclusion

Prehistoric trade in the Papua region had occurred long before the arrival of Austronesian speakers, namely exchanges that occurred among the Melanesian people who were the first immigrants to Papua. After the arrival of the Austronesian speakers, the exchange became more lively and the objects exchanged became more diverse by bringing out new objects such as pottery, bronze tools, Indo-Pacific beads, glass bracelets, ceramics, and Timorese cloth and others. These objects all came from outside the territory of Papua, which after reaching the hands of the Papuans got a different position of value and function, namely being used as a means of paying dowry and customary fines as well as being a medium of exchange of high value such as Timorese cloth in the bird's head area, plates Chinese ceramics in the Saireri area, beads and stone axes in the Sentani Lake area and so on.

As for the description of prehistoric trade in Papua with reference to ethnographic and ethnohistorical data, where the conditions of cultural development in Papua were quite slow so that prehistoric patterns of life can still be found in the Papua region even today, it can be assumed that the pattern of exchange that was carried out by barter, namely exchange between clans within tribes, exchanges between nearby tribes, between coastal and inland tribes, and exchanges between islands, with the pattern of distribution of goods to be exchanged can be done directly in meetings between sellers and buyers, some are through intermediaries, some come directly to place of production, some are carried out in places that have been mutually agreed upon.

The exchange model is carried out in the form of reciprocity which is generally more social than economic in nature, then in the form of redistribution with an intermediary or the presence of a middleman, as well as market exchange in places that have been mutually agreed upon. The goods exchanged are generally in the form of garden products, forest products, marine products, hunting products, livestock, and technological goods. Especially for technological objects besides having economic value, they also have socio-cultural value in the life of the Papuan people. Apart from that, you can also see the presence of *Cypraea Moneta* shells which are used by mountain communities as a medium of *exchange (traditional money) with the terms of each tribe*.

Thank-You Note

Thank you to Mr. DR. Daud Aris Tanudirjo who has helped us a lot in completing this paper, both in the form of literature as well as discussion time and suggestions for perfecting writing about prehistoric trade in Papua in particular and in Southeast Asia-Pacific in general.

References

1. "<https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perdagangan>, diakses tanggal 21 APRIL 2022." .
2. T. S. Nastiti, *Pasar di Jawa pada Masa Mataram Kuna Abad VIII – IX Masehi*. Jakarta: Dunia Pustaka Jaya, 2003.
3. F. A. Utami, "Apa Itu Barter?," *Warta Ekonomi*. diakses tanggal 21 April 2022., Jakarta, 2020.
4. D. A. Tanudirdjo, "Interaksi Austronesia-Melanesia Kajian Interpretasi Teoritis," in *Austronesia dan Melanesia di Nusantara (Irfan Mahmud dan Erlin Novita Idje Djami, Eds)*, Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ombak. p.23–41, 2011.

5. S. Chia, "The Obsidian Industry At Bukit Tengkorak, Sabah, Malaysia," in *Paper presented at the 16th Congress of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, Melaka, Malaysia*, pp. 1–14, 1998
6. E. N. I. Djami, "Gua Togece: Jejak Hunian Awal Manusia di Lembah Balim Pegunungan Tengah Papua," *J. Arkeol. Papua*, vol. Vol.12 No., p. 1–19, 2020.
7. C. Renfrew and P. Bahn, *Archaeology: Theories, Methodes and Practice*. London: British Library, 2008.
8. T. Simanjuntak, *Manusia-Manusia dan Peradaban Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 2020.
9. A. D. Setiawan, "Ragam Temuan Arkeologis Masa Prasejarah Dari Kawasan Highland, Tambrau, Papua Barat dan Peluang Pemanfaatannya," in *Buku Prosiding Seminar Nasional Hasil Penelitian Arkeologi. Pengelolaan dan Pengembangan Sumberdaya Arkeologi Papua Untuk Kepentingan Pembangunan (Masa Lalu, Masa Kini dan Masa Depan)* (I Wayan Ardika eds), Penerbit Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset Dan Teknologi. Balai Arkeologi Papua. p.61–72, 2021.
10. Y. T. S. Setiawan, Adi Dian, Sonya M. Kawer, Amurwani Putri, Ishak Nda Ansaka, *Karakteristik Gerabah Prasejarah di Wilayah Adat Domberai dan Bomberai, Papua Barat (Kajian Bentuk, Teknologi, Fungsi dan Motif Hias)*. Laporan Penelitian Desk Study Arkeologi. Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan. Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan dan Perbukuan. Pusat Penelitian Arkeologi Nasional. Balai Arkeologi Papua, 2020.
11. S. C. Sukandar, "Nilai Penting Pulau Abidon Raja Ampat," in *Pengelolaan Dan Pengembangan Sumberdaya Arkeologi Papua Untuk Kepentingan Pembangunan (Masa Lalu, Masa Kini Dan Masa Depan)*, p. 27–36, 2021.
12. E. N. I. Djami, "Megalitik Gunung Srobu Dalam Konteks Budaya Melanesia," *AMERTA J. Penelit. dan Pengemb. Arkeol.*, vol. Vol.28, no. No.2 Desember. Pusat Penelitian Arkeologi Nasional. Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan., p.129–144, 2020.
13. P. Bellwood, *Prasejarah Kepulauan Indo-Malaysia*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama., 2000.
14. P. S. Soejono, "Prehistori Irian Barat," in *Penduduk Irian Barat*, (eds. Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar), Ed. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas, p. 39 – 54, 1963,
15. P. Swadling, *Plumes From Paradise. Trade cycles in outer Southeast Asia and their impact on New Guinea and nearby islands until 1920*. 2019.
16. E. N. I. Djami, "Akulturasi Budaya Austronesia – Australomelanesid di Situs Gunung Srobu". Laporan Penelitian Arkeologi. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Balai Arkeologi Papua., 2019.
17. H. W. Bachtiar, "Sejarah Irian Barat," in *Penduduk Irian Barat*, K. dan H. W. Bachtiar., Ed. Indonesia: PT. Penerbitan Universitas, 1963, p. 55–94.
18. K. Muller, *Introducing Papua*. Daisy World Books, 2008.
19. F. C. H. Kamma, *De Mesiaanse Koreri – Bewegingen In Het Biaks-Noemfoorse Cultuurgebied, di Indonesiakan oleh Kaleb Mnubepiom, dengan judul: "Gerakan Mesianis di Daerah Berbudaya Biak-Numfor*. The Hague-Martinus Nijhoff., 1972.
20. S. M. Kawer, "Perdagangan Besi Pada Masyarakat Biak Numfor," *J. Arkeol. Papua Vol 7 No. 1 Juni*, p. 35–43, 2020.
21. K. Fairyo, "Gerabah Mansinam Kajian Etnoarkeologi," *J. Arkeol. Papua Vol I No. 2 November*, 2009.
22. F. Veldkamp, "Membuka Lembah Baliem, Menghadapi Dejumlah Dilema," in *Pim Schoorl. Belanda Di Irian Jaya. Amtenar di Masa Penuh Gejolak 1945- 1962.*, KITLV Press, Leiden, p. 61–102, 2001.
23. Koentjaraningrat, "Orang Timorini," in *Penduduk Irian Barat (Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar eds.)*, Jakarta: PT Penerbitan Universitas. p. 216–231, 1963.

24. J. T. S. Lin, "Orang Muyu," in *Penduduk Irian Barat (Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar eds.)*, Jakarta: PT Penerbitan Universitas. p. 233–251, 1963.
25. H. Daeng, "Orang Marind Anim," in *Penduduk Irian Barat (Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar ed.)*, Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar, Ed. Indonesia: PT. Penerbitan Universitas, p. 251–272, 1963.
26. M. A. Sutaarga, "Orang Mimika," in *Penduduk Irian Barat (Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar eds.)*, Jakarta: PT Penerbitan Universitas. p. 273–300., 1963.
27. S. Boedhisantoso, "Orang Kapauku," in *Penduduk Irian Barat (Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar ed.)*, Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar ed., Ed. Indonesia: Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar ed, p. 300–320, 1963
28. Koentjaraningrat, "Orang Mey Brat," in *Penduduk Irian Barat (Koentjaraningrat dan Harsja W. Bachtiar eds.)*, Jakarta: PT Penerbitan Universitas, p. 321–336, 1963.
29. E. Kabey, "Sistem Perdagangan Tradisional Dalam Komunitas Orang Buyaka," *Jurnal Arkeologi Papua Vol 7 No. 1 Juni*, p. 67–75, 2010.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

