Research Article

INTERNET SHUTDOWN POLICY AT PAPUA AND WEST PAPUA THROUGH THE PUBLIC POLICY PERSPECTIVE

Irnasya Shafira Hadi*, Riza Noer Arfani, Hakimul Ikhwan

Universitas Gadjah Mada, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Internet Shutdown policy implemented in August to September 2019 at Papua and West Papua has caused competing policy narrative between the government's main narration of national security and the civil society's contra narration of violation of human rights. This research aims to explain the Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua with public policy perspective with its main arguments hinged in human rights' perspective. This research uses qualitative approach in which the data-gathering were done through interviews with stakeholders, documents, and media statement andanalyzed using narrative policy analysis method. The result of this research shows that the polemic on Internet Shutdown in Papua happens because of the different belief systems held by the government and the civil society. The government's belief systemunderstands that security approach is the best approach in managing conflict in Papua,hence why Internet Shutdown is a viable way to manage said conflict. Whereas the civil society's belief system understands that Internet Shutdown is a violation of human rights because it is harmful for the general public.

Keywords: Internet shutdown, Narrative policy analysis, Polemic surrounding policy, Policy narratives

Introduction

In 2016, West (2021) found that there are approximately 81 cases of Internet Shutdown which happened across 19 countries from July 2015 to June 2016. This number keeps increasing even all the way to 2021. Netblocks, a non-profit organization dedicated to monitor Internet disruption has found numerous shutdowns and documented the durations and how it has reached national-scale. Government officers has given numerous reasons to order an Internet Shutdown, some of them are for reasons such guarding government's authorities, lessening public dissidence, countering terrorism, keeping the national security, or to protect local businesses (West, 2016).

Ordering an Internet Shutdown can be a dilemmatic decision. The best case to illustrate this dilemma will be the shutdown ordered by Myanmar's government in the midst of a military coup. Indonesia has also experienced this dilemma in 2019, when President Joko Widodo and the Ministry of Communication and Informatics (MoCI) issued the Internet Shutdown

order during the heat of demonstrations occurring across Papuan soil such as Fakfak, Sorong, Manokwari, and Jayapura. These demonstrations occur due to the outrage of Papuans which heard that there was a racist attack against some Papuan students situated in Surabaya, East Java. The government then chose to throttle or slow the internet services across some regions on 19 August 2019 which was followed by a total internet blockage on 21 August 2019, which lasted for two weeks. In the end, the government via MoCI, lifts the blockage at Papua and West Papua on 11 September 2019 (CNN Indonesia, 2020).

The Internet Shutdown policy in Papua is a form of action taken by the government to govern a conflict, but the objective, means, and the policy narration taken by the government to justify this action, along with how the civil society was not included in the decision-making process had caused a huge polemic which leads to the unlawful verdict given to the MoCI and President Joko Widodo by the State Administrative High Court.

Previous research on Internet Shutdown has been done by multiple scholars of differing disciplines (Rahman & Tang, 2022; Safitri & Noviadhista, 2020; Lee, 2020), but there hasn't been a research done to see the Internet Shutdown as a public policy. This points out a rather glaring gap in the policy studies since Internet Shutdown is a policy which is taken with the full intent of managing a conflict which threatens the national security, yet at the same time, national security as a concept and a deciding factor for a decision-making needs to criticized within the context of being a policy implemented in Papuan soil, which has a particular history with security approach. This particular history between Indonesia and the people of Papuan soil is the foundation of this research to analyze the polemic surrounding Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019 with Human Rights perspective as its main argumentative stance.

Based on this introduction, I realize that there are several problems that can and should be addressed in social research. Hence, this research aims to give a comprehensive explanation on Internet Shutdown policy and its sur-rounding polemic and explains about the competing policy narratives which makes the majority of the polemic surrounding Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019.

Literature Review

This section aims to develop a common perception about all the related concepts and theories used to understand this research. Rather than defining definitions, I will explain four major lenses used to analyze the Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua in 2019.

Internet Shutdown as a Human Rights' Limitation Instrument

Access to internet has been recognized as a highly crucial civil right in the digital era, especially when the world keeps moving to a much more digitalized life. The global pandemic has quite literally forced all of us to digitalize our lives, hence why the rights embedded on the mankind in the real-life has to move to the same direction. Indonesia ourselves has ratified two international conventions which guarantee the right to access and freely express oneself in the cyberspace in Law No. 11 Year 2005 on Ratification of International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and Law No. 12 Year 2005 on Ratification of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). And while Indonesia does not currently have a specific law on internet access and freedom of expression in the internet, it does have the law to protect one's freedom of expression in Article 14 Verse 1 and 2 of Law No. 39 Year 1999 on Human Rights and Article 19 of ICCPR. Thus, from all these bases, we can conclude that access of internet is a form of derogable human right and its limitation should follow the proper procedure on limiting human rights.

Internet Shutdown functions as a policy instrument utilized by the state to guard peace and suppress dissidence in the era where population has high capability for mobility (Sutterlin, 2020: 19). Hence why Internet Shutdown can be seen as an instrument to limit one's rights to access the internet, which is a huge part of people's life in the digital era.

National Security: The Duty to Maintain Public Order or a Policy Justification?

Wahyono (2000: 29-33) understands the concept of national security as a prerequisite for all other aspects of civil society's livelihood; that only within a nation which national security is guaranteed that people may live a sound life, hence why the state has sworn duty to maintain them. The state of national security is highly dependent on the interaction of politics, economics, social, and cultural aspects alongside the defense and security in a point of equilibrium. The existence of cyberspace obviously disrupts this equilibrium; hence it is imperative for the national security to be maintained in the cyberspace as well (Wahyono, 2000: 28-29).

In the polar opposite of this thought will be the research done by Williamson and Malik (2020), who found that authoritarian regime often justifies repression by accusing their opposition of violence which prompts the regime to use security approach for the safety of the people. This research found that as long as the state controlled the narration surrounding a justification of murder, people tend to support their (the state's) decision.

These two thoughts exist in the polar opposite on how to understand the concept of national security. In this research, I am using the concept of national security as the base of the state's action without discounting Williamson and Malik's (2020) view when analyzing the contra narration of Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua in 2019.

Public Policy Perspective

The discipline of public policy has plethora of theories and concepts available to understand what constitutes as a 'policy'. Dunn (2003: 10-13) understands public policy as a "way to synthesize information to create alternatives and preferences presented with quantitative and qualitative terms which are comparable as a base or guide for policy decisions; conceptually, the process of policy analysis does not include the gathering of information and data" and this research adheres to this understanding of what a policy is.

There are many versions of how the process of public policymaking goes. Abdoellah and Rusfina (2016: 40) explained the steps of public policymaking as such: 1) Agenda-setting stage, 2) Policy formulation, 3) Policy adoption/ legitimation, 4) Policy implementation, and 5) Policy evaluation. In this research, I will focus on the agenda-setting stage, where I assume that a huge gap has happened during the Internet Shutdown policy's policymaking process.

Ripley (1985, in Taufiqurakhman, 2014: 18) explains that within the agenda-setting stage, there are three activities which needed to be done. First, building the stakeholders' perception that a phenomenon is problematic since a phenomenon can be perceived many ways by the stakeholders involved. Second, create a problem limitation. Finally, mobilizing support so the phenomenon/problem can be part of the government's agenda. The mobilization can be done with organizing non-government organizations (NGOs), political powers, mass media publication, and others.

The involvement of civil society as part of a policy's interest group is extremely crucial. This sings the same tune as the system theory, which believes that policymaking cannot be taken out of the three elements which constitutes the public policy system (Taufiqurakhman, 2014: 20). Dye (2015) explains that the system theory believes that Political Institution, Policy Environment, and Public Policy exists in an interlinked triangle model which constitutes a system in which a public policy is created. In this research, I surmise that the Government is the Political Institution, the Civil Society is the Policy Environment, and Internet Shutdown as the Public Policy.

When the civil society element of the system is not included in the triangle and the policymaking process, they are bound to enter the policy scene through other ways, such as creating a contra narration for the Internet Shutdown. Narrative policy analysis exposes how different assumptions which contrasts one another create a whole new reality (Shanahan, Jones & McBeth, 2018).

Theoretical Proposition

Based on the explanations in the Introduction and Literature Review, here are my main theoretical propositions for this research:

1. There is a gap in the process of Internet Shutdown policy's decision-making process, which are:
   a. The lack of legal bases to serve as the state's legitimation to order an Internet Shutdown policy; and
   b. The civil society's lack of inclusion as an interest group of a public policy which causes a huge polemic surrounding a policy.
2. The state's narration to justify Internet Shutdown is the state's concerns towards of the national security which is threatened by the violent demonstrations at Papua and West Papua which allegedly turns even more violent due to the spread of hoaxes across social media.
3. The civil society's contra narration is that access to internet is a form of human rights which should be done according to the regulations of limiting human rights. Internet Shutdown is also a form of human rights' violation aimed to repress the Papuans and West Papuans' freedom of expression.

Research Method

This research uses the qualitative approach in adherence to its main purpose to explain the polemic surrounding Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019. Moleong (2007: 6) defines qualitative research as research done to understand a phenomenon holistically through description and narration in its natural context using empirical method, hence why this research has to use qualitative approach.

This research is done using explanatory qualitative content analysis method. The data is gathered through interview with stakeholders, media content analysis, and literature studies. The data is then analyzed with Miles and Huberman's (1994, in Emzir, 2010) qualitative data analysis method of data gathering, data reduction, data display, and conclusion followed with Jones, Shanahan and McBeth's (2014) Narrative Policy Analysis (NPA) with the plot element serving as the chronology of deciding and implementing of Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019.

Results and Discussion
A. General Overview of Sociopolitical Context Surrounding Papua and West Papua

Papua and West Papua are very complex lands with complex sociopolitical context. In this section, I will point out some general overview which will bring deeper understanding of the sociopolitical context of the Internet Shutdown policy being done in the Papuan soil

Brief History of Conflict at Papua and West Papua

When discussing Papuan soil, it is nearly impossible not to mention the conflict surrounding them. If we are to trace the origin of Papua conflict, it dates back to the start of Indonesia's independence (Alhumami, 2006 in Al Araf et. al, 2011: 10). But if we are to look at a specific event, then it started from the handover of Papua area to Indonesia's administration by the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority on 1 May 1963. Sugandi (2009, in Al Araf et. al 2011: 11) explains that there are different perceptions on the historical basis of the union between Papua area and Indonesia. Many armed separatist movements were formed and were active for more than 30 years since Papua united with Indonesia, and it shows many indications of human rights violation (McGibbon in Al Araf et. al, 2011: 11).

The waves of disappointment experienced by the Papuans leads to the demand for independence in 1998. The central government then lost initiative and fell into a state of confusion. The concept of Special Autonomy came as an initiative from the Papuans as a new solution to address the tension between central government and the Papuans. Special Autonomous Region of Papua is expected to act as a 'goodwill to fix broken relations' which puts high hopes on how both the central government and the Papuans will correct and trust each other in order to create a new relationship based on new approaches and values to follow.

The Effects of Security Approach: Belief which Chokes Everything Else

Though the relationship between Indonesia and Papua are better these days, there are some lingering sentiments which remain.

Indonesia's Science Institute (LIPI) identifies four complex problems that are still haunting the Indonesia-Papua relationship until today: 1) Marginalization of indigenous Papuans, especially in economic rights as an aftereffect of migration, 2) Failure of development programs in Papua to solve economic marginalization, 3) differing fundamental perceptions on the history between Jakarta and Papua, and 4) the state's violence against Papuans (Suryawan, 2020: 7). The fourth point becomes extremely relevant when analyzing how the government used security as the main concern of Internet Shutdown. Suryawan (2020) further explains that that violence occurs from the long periods of time when Papua was ruled under the military-security approach which always mentions the problem of "separatists" as justification for the unending security approach when handling the many problems of Papuan soil.

One of the areas affected by the prolonged use of security approach in Papuan soil is how closed-off information are in regards to anything which happens in Papua. The Press Freedom Index (PFI) of Papua and West Papuan Press are ranked the lowers from all 34 provinces in Indonesia with West Papua sitting on 71.06 out of 100 and Papua on 70.42 out of 100. These low PFI scores are due to the political dynamics which happened in 2019 (general election), the many cases of violence against journalists in Papua, and the Internet Shutdown case at Papua and West Papua (Bayu, 2020). Abrar (2020) explains that information from Papua is often limited by the security apparatus who will often sleep in media offices to 'keep watch' of the news that are produced and despite President Joko Widodo's policy to welcome foreign press, information around Papua is still very tightly controlled. There are many instances when local media which covers how security apparatus violate indigenous people's rights are intimidated, beaten by the apparatus, then stigmatized as pro-separatist. Komarudin (2016) states that the violence-based approach and the effort to hide anything that goes in Papua have worsen the people's disappointment towards the state.

Needless to say, the state's history and strong belief that "separatists" are those who criticized the Indonesian government, indiscriminate of the fact that some critiques are done peacefully, continuously enable the state to hold on to a belief system that the security approach is the best approach when handling problems occurring on the Papuan soil. This becomes a huge pivotal point of how the Internet Shutdown policy was decided during the policymaking process.

Papua and Accessibility of Internet

Internet is a huge player to ease the information blackhole surrounding Papuan soil, yet there are many problems surrounding Papua's internet services. Extreme geographic condition is one of the main factors why some Papuans live an isolated lifestyle focusing on small groups' traditions. Differing geographical situation also caused development of Papua to be difficult, thus it needed a breakthrough to ensure that the government can reach even the most remote of places (Suryawan, 2017: 122). I believe that internet can serve as this breakthrough, but research done by Ibnugraha dan Fahrudin (2014) proves that there are only 64 unit of internet infrastructures spread across four regions of Papua Province with such uneven numbers of 58% for Merauke District, 33% for Keerom District, 8% for Tolikara District, and 2% of Pegunungan Bintang District. This shows that internet infrastructures are not spread evenly in Papua and it creates a sentiment that no internet connection is a part of their life and this sentiment can be problematic in the future since Indonesia is heading into a much more digitalized country where sectors such as economy, education, and even public services utilize internet for its services.

Transferring information in Papuan soil has proven to be difficult due to its geographic extremities and the press has been fighting tooth and nail to advocate for the openness of information in Papua. The existence of local news outlet, such as Tabloid Jubi and Suara Papua, who constantly cover the happenings in Papua with local perspective is seen as a huge improvement and is even dubbed as 'the Oxygen of Papua' by the locals (Abrar, 2020).

From this section, we can infer that the Papuan soil harbors complicated history with Indonesia (the government), especially so about the security approach and the effects it has

made. The long history in which the government has relied on the security approach has since then become a very entrenched belief system which then eventually becomes the driving force of the main narration for the justification of Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua in 2019.

B. Polemic Surrounding Internet Shutdown Policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019

The process of how Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua was made and implemented in 2019 is documented in Verdict No. 230/G/TF/2019/PTUN-JKT State Administrative High Court in the form of statements made by Semuel Abrijani Pengerapan, Director General Informatics Application of MoCI in 2019 and Police Inspector General Rudolf Alberth Rodja, Head of Papua Province's Police Force in the court processions of Internet Shutdown case. There are 50 relevant points in their statements which essentially tells that:

1. The decision to do Internet throttling was made in a Whatsapp Group discussion on 19 August 2019. The group consists of members of MoCI, CEOs of Internet Service Provider Companies, and various security apparatus such as National Intelligence Agency and Coordinating Ministry of Politics, Law, and Human Rights.
2. The decision is based upon the immediate concern on how to control riots (demonstrations) happening at Papua and West Papua based on Article 40 Electronic Information and Transaction Law (ITE Law) which obligates the government to control situations that causes disrupts public order.
3. Throttling policy is chosen because security apparatus in Papua and West Papua, based on intel from intelligence agency, believes that information spreading around aren't controllable and cannot be mediated through the normal means (censorship law).
4. Due to the 'extraordinary' circumstances, the normal content-blocking procedures are unable to contain the speed of information spreading hence slowing down information is needed.
5. The policy to slow Internet in the infrastructure level is needed because in the normal procedure to control hoax, fake news, misinformation, and disinformation requires MoCI to send letters to service providers (social media companies). Seeing as the situation in Papua is abnormal and specific, thus MoCI takes a more 'practical step' which bypasses the civil rights of service providers.
6. There are confidential meetings which discusses disintegration (of Papua from Indonesia) due to findings that there are foreign IT services which posts disinformation using Bahasa Indonesia. Thus, security approach is needed in this situation.

It can be inferred from these statements that security approach is the main approach during the decision-making process of the Internet Shutdown policy. This is highly problematic for a few reasons: 1) security approach has caused numerous human rights violations in Papua and has also been proven to be unable to solve the conflicts at Papua, even going as far as causing the opposite effect (al Araf et. al, 2011: 3-6), 2) the sentiments behind the "extraordinary circumstances" which necessitates the MoCI to take "practical step" which bypasses civil law are not made clear. Indonesia already has a set of law to govern over "extraordinary circumstances which threatens national security" and for a situation to be legitimately seen as "extraordinary" there are many prerequisites to fulfill before the government can decide upon a policy, the main one being official declaration from the President or High-Ranking Military Commander (Nuh, 2011), which is nonexistent in the case of Internet Shutdown in 2019. I will expand upon the many holes in the legitimacy of Internet Shutdown policy in the following sections.

Competing Narratives of Internet Shutdown Policy in Papua and West Papua in 2019 in Narrative Policy Framework

As I have mentioned previously, there are two competing narratives which makes the polemic surrounding Internet Shutdown policy in 2019. The main narrative of Internet Shutdown policy came from the Indonesian government, which was driven by their concern for the national security being threatened. Most of the government's narration came in the form of press releases published in MoCI's website and

government officials' statement to mass media. The summary to narrative components of Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019 is as follows.

Table 1. Narrative Components on Internet Shutdown Policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019

Narrative Form	
Level of analysis	Meso: Indonesian Government (Ministry of Communication and Informatics, Office of Presidential Staffs, Coordinating Ministry of Politics, Law, and Human Rights, National Intelligence Agency, Security Apparatus) as the main policymakers of Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua.
Setting	The high number of hoaxes, fake news, misinformation and disinformation available in the cyberspace which instigates riot in areas across Papua which lead to the need for Internet Shutdown to protect national security
Characters	Protagonist: President, the government (central and regional), security apparatus across Papua Antagonist: 'rioting' Papuans, external parties which instigates 'disintegration' in Papua
Moral of the story	Victim: Security apparatus and Papuans who are affected by the riots. Internet Shutdown is narrated as a solution to prevent the spread of hoax which are also expected to decelerate the speed of information which instigates riots
Narrative Contents	
Belief System	Internet Shutdown will slow and decelerate the speed in which huge amount of hoaxes spreading around the cyberspace Slowing the Internet will help the effort to stabilize riots occurring around Papua Securing the situation in Papua is the most important factor in handling the riots caused by demonstrations by Papuans
Strategy	Throttling or slowing the access/bandwidth in some areas in Papua and West Papua Province on 19 August 2019; Blocking data services and/or disconnecting internet access completely (Internet Shutdown) in Papua Province (29 cities/districts) and West Papua (13 cities/districts) from 21 August 2019 until at least 4 September 2019 at 23.00 WIT; Prolonging the blockings of data services and/or disconnecting internet access completely in 4 cities/districts in Papua Province (Jayapura City, Jayapura District, Mimika District, dan Jayawijaya District) dan 2 cities/district at West Papua (Manokwari City and Sorong City) from 4 September 2019 at 23.00 WIT until 9 September 2019 at 18.00 WIB / 20.00 WIT.; Mobilizing security apparatus to suppress the riots in Papua and West Papua

If we are to infer from its narrative components, we can see similarities to the one used by Myanmar government which did an Internet Shutdown based on their concern of the many hoaxes spreading in the social media (Reuters, 2021). At the time, the Myanmar government (through their President and Power of the State) has declared a state of emergency (Myawaddy News, 2021). But in the context of Indonesia, there is no such declaration about how Indonesia (Papua) is in a state of emergency.

In a competing narrative study, there is always a contra narration which contrasts the main narration given by the policymakers. The results from the main narration and contra narration are then compared to create a metanarrative analysis (Dwiguna & Munandar, 2020; Asmoro & Lindiasari, 2021). In the case of Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua the

contra narration is provided by the civil society who are mainly represented by NGOs. These NGOs are comprised of Elsam (a human rights policy advocacy institution), AJI Indonesia (alliance of independent journalists), LBH Pers (a pro bono legal aid services dealing exclusively with press-related legal cases), KontraS (an NGO which focuses on protection of human rights), Institute of Criminal Justice Reform (ICJR, an institution which advocates for reformation of criminal justice system in Indonesia), SAFENet (an NGO which focuses in protection of digital rights across Southeast Asia), YLBHI (an association which heads other pro bono legal aid services in Indonesia), who are part of a coalition which sued the President and MoCI to the State Administrative High Court. They also act as the stakeholders interviewed in this research. All these NGOs provided similar statements which boiled down to how the Internet Shutdown at large is a form of human rights violation and is done by the government without proper legitimation. They also noted the amount of loss caused by Internet Shutdown, be it material or immaterial.

By comparing these two narrations, then we find that the competing narratives which makes the polemic surrounding Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua in 2019 is caused by the fundamental difference of belief systems held by the two opposing sides which are explained in the following table.

Table 2. Metanarrative Analysis of Internet Shutdown Policy at Papua and West Papua in 2019

Main Narrative	Contra Narrative	Cause of Difference
Internet Shutdown will slow and decrease the speed of hoax and false information spreading.	Internet Shutdown worsens the spread of hoax and false information because fact checking becomes impossible to do.	There is a fundamental difference between the assumptions held by the two parties. The main narration assumes that turning off the internet will stop the spread of hoax and false information, thus there won't be a riot since there isn't any instigating information. Whereas the contra narrative assumes that the absence of information can act as the instigating factor of riots.
Slowing the internet will help the effort to stabilize the riots occurring all over Papua.	Slowing the internet complicates the effort to stabilize riots occurring all over Papua.	There is a difference in placing security apparatus as an instrument to stabilize riots in Papua and West Papua. The main narration places the people who rioted as an object of Internet Shutdown with the assumption that slowing information will eliminate the instigating factor and thus stabilizing the situation, whereas contra narration places security apparatus as object from Internet Shutdown with the assumption that internet is one of the tools which facilitates mobilizing efforts of the security apparatus.
Securing the situation in Papua and West Papua is the most important factor in the handling the riots caused by demonstrations in Papua and West Papua.	Security is not the most important factor, but only one of the factors that should be monitored during demonstrations at Papua and West Papua.	There is a difference in the way the two narrations view the security factor. The main narration understands security a key factor to analyze the situation at Papua and West Papua whereas the contra narration understands security as 'just another factor' that isn't more important to warrant limiting the right to access internet.

Main Narrative	Contra Narrative	Cause of Difference
Article 40 ITE Law is a strong legitimacy for the government to execute Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua to main order during chaotic situations.	Article 40 ITE Law is does not hold legitimacy for the government to execute Internet Shutdown at Papua and West Papua to main order during chaotic situations.	There is a difference in the way the two narration understands Article 40 of ITE Law. The main narration interprets Article 40 of ITE Law as law which obliges the government to limit information as a way to handle chaotic situations at Papua and West Papua whereas the contra narration believes that Article 40 ITE Law cannot stand alone in chaotic situation at Papua and West Papua and has to work in tandem with Emergency Situation Law to legitimize limitation of human rights.

The Flaws in the Policymaking Process of Internet Shutdown Policy in Papua and West Papua in 2019

As previously mentioned, the first step of public policymaking is the agenda-setting, where three activities should be done to ensure that enough interest is garnered for the policy to make it to the government's agenda. In the case of Internet Shutdown, all three activities are skipped for "practicality" in an "extraordinary" situation. I have critiqued the legitimacy of "extraordinary" situation surrounding Papua and West Papua in 2019, but if we are to entertain the thought, then there is still a fatal flaw in the policymaking process of Internet Shutdown policy.

To some extent, the agenda-setting activity where the stakeholders convene to build perception that a phenomenon is indeed a problem have been done via Whatsapp Group which consists of relevant of government bodies that discusses field reports of what happened in Papuan soil. But the absence of any body to represent civil society in said Whatsapp Group shows that policymakers does not see civil society as part of relevant interest group. Then the activity to create a problem limitation was done by these interest groups which comprises exclusively of government bodies. This becomes a huge problem when taken into context that the government has had history of having a deeply entrenched belief system that situations in Papuan soil absolutely needs security approach to solve.

The absence of civil society in the process of Internet Shutdown policymaking has also created a huge gap in the interlinked triangle shape of Dye's system theory. Instead of existing as part of a policymaking system, the civil society element is forced to watch at sidelines as the government decided upon Internet Shutdown policy. This in turn created a huge polemic surrounding Internet Shutdown policy in 2019. I also find that this absence caused a huge detriment where the decision-making process of Internet Shutdown policy suffers from a lack of public-centric perspective which does not have the belief system of security approach as the best approach for handling conflicts in Papuan soil.

Article 40 of ITE Law does not provide the necessary policy legitimation for Internet Shutdown policy. While Verse 2 does state that government has to protect public order from all interference from the misuse of electronic information, Verse 2(a) of Article 40 ITE Law states that the government is only obligated to stop the spread of electronic information/documents which contents are forbidden by law. This means that ITE Law does not allow for disconnection of internet in physical infrastructure level and rendering the legitimacy invalid.

Conclusion

From the explanations above, it can be concluded that the polemic surrounding Internet Shutdown policy at Papua and West Papua happened because of the fundamental difference

between the belief systems held by the government, the main narrator of Internet Shutdown policy who believed that Internet Shutdown is a legitimate policy driven by security approach, and the belief systems held by the civil society who believed that Internet Shutdown is a violation of human rights. This belief system also serves as the main reason why the government decided to enact the Internet Shutdown policy. This policy is inherently ill-suited for the Papuans, who had a particular history with Indonesian government's use of security approach to handle their conflict.

Suggestions

The main problem of this phenomenon is how a belief system affects how the relevant government bodies move during a situation which requires a delicate approach. While this study has its limitations of only discussing the narrations of Internet Shutdown policy, it also finds that the exclusion of civil society in policy-making process may incur a huge polemic surrounding a policy. Thus, I recommend the inclusion of at least one NGO during these delicate policies to ensure the existence of a public-centric views during the decision-making stage.

Acknowledgment

References

Abdoellah, A. Y., & Rusfiana, Y. (2016). *Teori & Analisis Kebijakan Publik.* Bandung:ALFABETA

Abrar, A. N. (2020). 'Seolah-olah jurnalisme': Bagaimana represi kekuasaan memaksa pers Papua jadi corong negara [https://theconversation.com/seolah-olah-jurnalisme-bagaimana-represi-kekuasaan-memaksa-pers-papua-jadi-corong-negara-147935] 29 July 2021

Al Araf, et. al. (2011). *Sekuritisasi Papua: Implikasi Pendekatan Keamanan terhadapKondisi HAM di Papua.* Jakarta: Imparsial

Asmoro, W., & Lindiasari, S. P. (2021). ANALISIS NARATIF KEBIJAKAN: KEBIJAKAN GANJA MEDIS DI INDONESIA. *Matra Pembaruan. 5(1), 13-24*

Bayu, D. J. (2020). Kebebasan Pers di Jakarta dan Papua Paling Rendah [https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2020/09/15/kebebasan-pers-di-jakarta-dan-papua-paling-rendah] 29 July 2021

CNN Indonesia. (2020). Kronologi Blokir Internet Papua Berujung Vonis untuk Jokowi. [https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20200603150311-20-509478/kronologi-blokir-Internet-papua-berujung-vonis-untuk-jokowi] 16 March 2021

Dunn, W. N. (2003). *Public policy analysis 3rd edition*. Routledge.

Dwiguna, A. R., & Munandar, A. I. (2020). ANALISIS NARATIF KEBIJAKAN PANGAN NASIONAL MELALUI PROGRAM FOOD ESTATE. *Publica: Jurnal Administrasi Pembangunan Dan Kebijakan Publik*, *11*(2), 273-284.

Dye, T. R. (2017). *Understanding Public Policy 15th edition.* Pearson Education Inc. Emzir. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Analisis Data.* Jakarta: Raja Grafindo

Emzir. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Analisis Data.* Jakarta: Raja Grafindo

Ibnugraha, P. D., & Fahrudin, T. (2014). Persebaran Layanan dan Infrastruktur Telekomunikasi Provinsi Papua. *Jurnal Infotel*, *6*(1), 37-42.

Jones, M., Shanahan, E., & McBeth, M. (Eds.). (2014). *The science of stories:Applications of the narrative policy framework in public policy analysis*. Springer.

Lee, A. (2020). Online Hoaxes, Existential Threat, and Internet Shutdown: A Case Study of Securitization Dynamics in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities*, *10*(1), 17-34.

Komarudin, A. (2016). Quo Vadis Kebebasan Pers di Papua? [http://www.politik.lipi.go.id/kolom/kolom-1/kolom-papua-2/1078-quo-vadis-kebebasan-pers-di-papua] 29 July 2021

Miles, M.B, Huberman, S.J. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis.* Sage Publications

Moleong, L. J. (2007). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif edisi revisi.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 103.

Myawaddy News (2021). Myanmar declared state of emergency for a year through television channel Myawaddy News. The statement is made by Min Aung Hlaing, Commander of Defense Institution which acts as the Power of the State and U Myint Swe, the Vice President which acts as the President.

This statement is accessed from [https://www.mmtimes.com/news/myanmaran-nounces-stateemergency.html?__cf_chl_jschl_tk__=pmd_7961c43943e62c2a46b29d46ee284afd554446ec-1626790787-0-gqNtZGzNAg2jcnBszQZ6] 20 July 2021

Nuh, M. S. N. S. (2011). Hakekat Keadaan Darurat Negara (State of Emergency) sebagai Dasar Pembentukan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM*, *18*(2), 229-246.

Pengadilan Tinggi Usaha Negara, Putusan No.230/G/TF/2019/PTUN-JKT

Rahman, R. A., & Tang, S. M. (2022). Fake News and Internet Shutdowns in Indonesia: Symptoms of Failure to Uphold Demoracy. *Constitutional Review*, *8* (1), 151-183.

Reuters. (2021). Myanmar junta blocks Facebook to shut down dissent as West increases pressure [https://indianexpress.com/article/world/myanmar- junta-blocks-facebook-to-shut-down-dissent-as-west-increases-pressure-7173981/] on 16 March 2021

Safitri, R., & Noviadhista, U. F. (2020). Where Did Indonesian Online Media Pioneer Stand on Internet Shutdown Issue?. *Komunikator*, *12*(1), 1-10.

Shanahan, E. A., Jones, M. D., & McBeth, M. K. (2018). How to conduct a Narrative Policy Framework study. *The Social Science Journal*, *55*(3), 332-345.

Suryawan, I. N., (2017). *Papua Versus Papua: Perubahan dan Perpecahan Budaya.* Yogyakarta: LABIRIN

Suryawan, I. N., (2017). *Suara-Suara yang Dicampakkan: Ontran-Ontran Tak Berkesudahan di Bumi Papua.* Yogyakarta: BASABASI

Suryawan, I. N., (2020). *Siasat Elite Mencuri Kuasa: Dinamika Pemekaran Daerah di Papua Barat.* Yogyakarta: BASABASI

Taufiqurakhman. (2014). *Kebijakan Publik: Pendelegasian Tanggungjawab Negara Kepada Presiden Selaku Penyelenggara Pemerintahan.* Jakarta: Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Moestopo Beragama (Pers)

Undang-undang (UU) No. 19 Tahun 2016 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi Dan Transaksi Elektronik [https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/37582/uu-no-19-tahun-2016] 1 August 2021

Wahyono, W. (2000). Keamanan Nasional Dalam Perspektif Baru. *Jurnal KetahananNasional*, *5*(1), 19-34. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22146/jkn.23259

West, D. M. (2016). Internet Shutdowns cost countries $2.4 billion last year. *Centerfor Technological Innovation at Brookings, Washington, DC*. [https://www.brookings.edu/research/Internet-shutdowns-cost-countries-2-4-billion-last-year/] 16 March 2021

West, D.M. (2021). Shutting down the Internet. *Brookings Institution, February, 5,2021.* 2021. [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2021/02/05/shutting-down-the-Internet/] 16 March 2021

Williamson, S., Malik, M. (2020). Contesting narratives of repression: Experimental evidence from Sisi's Egypt. *Journal of Peace Research 1–16* DOI: 10.1177/0022343320961835