

Food and Energy Sovereignty as a Pancasila Economic Project: A Study of Soemitro's Book *Djojohadikusumo* Anti-colonialism

Anang Fahmi Luqmawan Putra¹, Yudhie Haryono^{2*}

¹ UIN Prof. KH Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, Indonesia

² Nusantara Centers, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author : ghibran15@yahoo.com

Article History

Received: 08-07-2026

Revised: 14-07-2026

Published: 30-07-2026

Keywords: Food, Energy, Pancasila Economy, Soemitro *Djojohadikusumo's Book*, Anti-colonialism

ABSTRACT

The documentary film "Pesta Babi" (Pig Feast) by Watchdoc, along with the accompanying narratives, has sparked a serious debate regarding the National Strategic Projects (PSN) in South Papua—specifically the food estate and bioethanol plantation projects. This article is not intended to silence legitimate criticism; indeed, criticism serves as a healthy vitamin for democracy. Rather, it aims to provide a comprehensive, constitutional, and value-based analytical framework for interpreting the Papua PSN policy through the lenses of "Soemitronomics" and Pancasila axiology. The central argument posits that the Papua PSN—provided it is implemented with proper governance, fairness, and respect for the constitutional rights of indigenous communities—represents a legitimate expression of national food and energy sovereignty. This constitutes a strategic imperative that Soemitro Djojohadikusumo had highlighted as early as the dawn of independence. Criticisms regarding implementation should be addressed through improved governance rather than the abandonment of the vision for sovereignty. Ultimately, the hope is that any development program will evolve to become increasingly effective and aligned with constitutional principles.

INTRODUCTION

The film entitled "Pesta Babi" by Dandhy Laksono and Cypri Dale—which was released with figures from Indonesia Corruption Indonesian Watch (ICW) and the New Indonesia Expedition—have catalyzed a wave of criticism against the National Strategic Project (PSN) in South Papua. The author's issue analysis report (May 10, 2026) noted that public sentiment toward this issue reached 70 percent negative, while the narrative that emerged centered on three major accusations: the seizure of indigenous land, massive deforestation, and military involvement, considered "the new face of colonialism."

Before entering into the analysis, it is important to emphasize one methodological principle: this article does not approach the issue with blind apologetics. It approaches it with

intellectual honesty, acknowledging the serious governance issues in the implementation of the National Strategic Programs (PSN), while simultaneously rejecting the narrative conclusion that the vision of national food and energy security itself is colonialism. Certainly, the intentions, programs, and implementation of food and energy security, sovereignty, and independence are legitimate and in line with our national ideals; they are even mandatory. Therefore, the distinction between policy vision and implementation errors is crucial and often overlooked in emotionally charged debates.

In the perspective of Soemitronomics — an economic paradigm built by Soemitro Djojohadikusumo throughout his life—developing food and energy security is not an ideological luxury. It is a prerequisite for the nation's survival in a global power structure that is never neutral. And within the axiological framework of Pancasila, this policy must simultaneously respect the rights of indigenous peoples, as mandated by the Second and Third Principles, which cannot be compromised.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design and Approach

This study uses a qualitative research design that is based on a critical systematic literature review methodology (*Critical Systematic Literature Review /CSLR*), enriched with comparative geopolitical analysis and value -based public policy analysis. policy analysis). As a conceptual-normative study that lies at the intersection of political economy, development studies, and social philosophy, this research does not produce primary empirical data through surveys or experiments (Creswell & Poth , 2018).

The research approach follows a critical interpretivism paradigm : not simply describing existing phenomena, but interpreting and evaluating them against normative frameworks—the Pancasila axiology and the Soemitronomics paradigm —while simultaneously examining the geopolitical context in which those frameworks must operate. This approach is appropriate for research questions that are essentially normative and strategic: "How should the Papua National Social Security Program (PSN) be implemented to ensure it is constitutional and just?" rather than "What is the current state of the Papua National Social Security Program (PSN)?" (Snyder , 2019).

Data Sources and Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted through systematic documentary analysis covering three main source categories selected based on direct relevance, scientific credibility, and temporal relevance:

First, the primary theoretical source: Soemitro's book Djojohadikusumo Anti-Colonialism: The Turmoil of Indonesian Political Economic Thought (Agus Rizal, Yudhie Haryono, & Dedi Setiadi, 2026) as the most comprehensive documentation of Soemitro's economic thought (Rizal et al. , 2026); Sindi Pramita et al.'s (2024) article in the Journal on Education as a philosophical framework of Pancasila as an axiological system (Pramita et al. ,

2024); the geoeconomic diagram of Design Thinking : Defense vs Domination Strategy (2026) as a contemporary structural diagnosis of the global power architecture (Design Thinking , 2026); and an issue analysis report on the film "Pesta Babi" (May 10, 2026) as a primary source of public sentiment data and the context of the debate.

Soemitro's selected works. Djojohadikusumo (1955, 1966, 1973); Rawls ' A Theory of Justice (1971); Prebisch on the dependency framework (1950); Frank on capitalism and underdevelopment (1967); Sen on development as freedom (1999); Ostrom on the management of common resources (1990); Nkrumah on neocolonialism (1965); and Kaelan on the Pancasila Nation State (2013)

Third, regulations and legal documents: the 1945 Constitution (Article 18B Paragraph 2, Article 28H, Article 33); Presidential Decree No. 109 of 2020 concerning National Strategic Projects; Law No. 2 of 2021 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua, Article 43; Law No. 32 of 2009 concerning the Environment; and Law No. 34 of 2004 concerning the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI).

Analytical Framework

The analytical procedure follows four stages. The first stage involves a content analysis of each primary source to extract core propositions, taxonomies, and normative claims. The second stage involves cross-referential mapping—systematically identifying convergences and divergences between Soemitronomics propositions , the axiological principles of Pancasila, the constitutional foundation, and the structural diagnosis of the geoeconomic framework. The third stage involves constructing a synthesis: producing an integrated framework in which the three intellectual pillars are shown to be mutually reinforcing, rather than simply running parallel. The fourth stage involves policy projection: identifying the concrete implications of the synthesized framework for the implementation of the Papua National Strategic Project (PSN) and formulating actionable strategic recommendations (Snyder , 2019).

The validity of the analysis is maintained through triangulation of three independent intellectual traditions (Soemitronomics , Pancasila philosophy, and geoeconomic diagnosis), as well as cross-referencing to established theoretical frameworks (distributive justice Rawlsian , dependency theory , developmental state theory, and international indigenous peoples' law). All analytical steps and source attributions are transparently documented.

Epistemological Position and Limitations

This research operates from an epistemological position of critical realism: it accepts that the structural conditions of global hegemony constitute a real causal mechanism that limits Indonesia's policy space, while simultaneously asserting that the normative framework—the axiology of Pancasila and the values of Soemitronomics —can provide principles that truly guide action and cannot be reduced to mere ideological preferences (Bhaskar , 1975). The main limitation of this research is its predominantly conceptual character : empirical validation of the proposed policy recommendations requires longitudinal quantitative analysis

of governance and economic indicators, which is beyond the scope of this work and constitutes a direction for further research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Geopolitical Context: Why Food and Energy Security Is Defense

The Three Poles of Indonesia's Food Strength and Vulnerability

The Geoeconomic Diagram of Design Thinking : Defense vs. Domination Strategy (2026) identifies three poles of global power that work simultaneously to shape structural inequality : Sovereign Power (USD 81 Trillion), Transcapital Power (USD 78 Trillion), and Technology Power (USD 6 Trillion). Indonesia, in the map, is categorized as the most vulnerable country to dependency—with a GDP of USD 3 trillion, which only reaches 3.7 percent of the total global Sovereign Power.

In this context, food and energy are not merely economic commodities. They are the most direct geopolitical instruments. The COVID-19 pandemic (2020-2022) and the Russia-Ukraine conflict (2022) empirically vindicate the warning Soemitro has been making since the 1950s: "Vital sectors must have a strong domestic base so that the country is not easily overwhelmed in a crisis." When global food supply chains are disrupted, countries dependent on imports face a real threat to their social and political stability.

Indonesia imports significant quantities of soybeans, sugar, wheat, and a number of strategic food products. This dependence is not simply an economic issue—it is a strategic vulnerability that places Indonesia in a weak bargaining position in the face of three poles of global dominance. Sovereign powers that control food supply chains can use them as instruments of diplomatic pressure. Transcapital powers that control commodity financing can create coercive conditions . In this geopolitical logic, building a domestic food production base—including in Papua—is not internal imperialism. It is a defense that Soemitro considered an obligation of a sovereign state. Indeed, a sovereign state is at the heart of the ideals of the proclamation.

We have long neglected constitutional and Pancasila-based economic discourse as both a tool and a national ideal: freedom, independence, modernity, and dignity . Therefore, we must re -echo this perspective . This is, of course, so that all development programs benefit the greatest possible prosperity for our citizens.

Papua in the Map of Resource Sovereignty

South Papua, with its vast agricultural potential and extraordinary wealth of natural resources, is a national strategic asset that cannot be left in a policy vacuum. The Design Thinking diagram places Indonesia in the "Resource & Commodity Anchor" category (9 Trillion USD) alongside Brazil, Australia, Saudi Arabia , and Canada. This position gives Indonesia bargaining power—but only if those resources are managed strategically, not simply left to market mechanisms dominated by foreign corporations.

Soemitro warned strongly about the dangers of exporting raw commodities without downstreaming : "Countries exporting raw materials tend to experience a decline in terms of of Papua, rich in resources but poor in infrastructure and domestic production capacity, is a perfect illustration of the trap Soemitro identified. A National Strategic Project (PSN) that transforms that potential into domestic production capacity—provided it is done correctly and implemented—is the right response from a Soemitro-nomic perspective.

Table 1: Indonesia's Food Security Position in the Context of the Three Poles of Global Hegemony

Dimensions of Vulnerability	Current Conditions in Indonesia	Relevance of Papua's National Strategic Project (Soemitronomic)
Food Sovereignty	Dependence on imports of soybeans, sugar, and wheat; vulnerable to shocks in the global supply chain	food estate builds a domestic production base as a bulwark against pressure from Sovereign Powers
Energy Sovereignty	Fossil dependence; energy transition without a domestic bioenergy base creates new vulnerabilities	Bioethanol plantations in Papua are an investment in long-term energy security in the green transition era.
Global Bargaining Position	Export of raw commodities without downstreaming weakens the position vis-à-vis Transcapital Power	PSN with a downstreaming scheme transforms commodities into value-added products that increase bargaining power.
Data Sovereignty & Narrative	The narrative about the Papua National Strategic Project (PSN) was formed and went viral through foreign platforms (Technology Power)	The urgency of robust data-driven policy communication through sovereign national platforms

Soemitronomic and Theoretical Foundation of the Papua National Strategic Project ***The State as Architect of Transformation: A Mandate That Cannot Be Delegated***

The first pillar of Soemitronomics asserts that the state must not simply be a spectator in the marketplace—it must be the architect of transformation. In the Papuan context, this means the state has a constitutional mandate and obligation to develop a region that has been left behind for decades due to a combination of colonial legacies, inequitable development concentrated in Java, and a lack of basic infrastructure.

The National Strategic Project (PSN) in South Papua is an expression of this mandate. The food barn and bioethanol plantation projects are not an invasion of foreign capital—they are state interventions aimed at transforming Papua's economic structure, which has historically resulted primarily in resource exploitation without adding local value. Soemitro emphasized: "Industry must be a way to overcome the colonial economy and lead to the

formation of national dignity." If implemented correctly, the PSN is the antithesis of colonialism—not a continuation of it.

Capital Formation : Building from Within, Not from Without

The third pillar of Soemitronomics — capital formation Domestic —directly relevant to the debate over who should manage and own the Papua National Strategic Project (PSN). Soemitro consistently rejected reliance on foreign capital as a source of development funding. However, he also rejected populism that rejects investment without offering concrete financing alternatives.

The strongest criticism of the Papua PSN from Soemitronomic's perspective is not "don't have a PSN"—but rather "who benefits from the added value?" If the Papua PSN generates a surplus that flows to large Jakarta corporations or foreign capital, it is a betrayal of the principle of capital development. However, if the National Strategic Project (PSN) is designed with a scheme that ensures the majority of added value remains in Papua—through local cooperatives, indigenous community shareholding, and mandatory local labor absorption—then it is the most authentic Soemitronomics instrument : building capacity from within.

Selective Integration and the Dangers of Narratives That Set the Nation Back

Soemitro warned that "a country without an industrial vision will only become a market for foreign products." A narrative that pits Papua's development against the absolute preservation of its resources—without offering a concrete alternative model—has the potential to trap Papua in a peripheral position that Soemitro called the "raw material export trap." A Papua that is rich but unable to build its own production capacity is a Papua that is continually dependent on central government budget flows, not an economically sovereign Papua.

Selective principle Integration teaches: it's not that major development projects should not occur, but rather that they must be based on national and local interests, not the interests of creditors or corporations. This differentiation is what distinguishes constitutional National Strategic Projects (PSN) from exploitative ones —and the difference lies in the quality of governance, not the existence of the projects themselves.

Pancasila Axiology: Five Principles Testing Papua's National Strategic Project

1. First Principle—Divinity: Development that Honors, Not Demeans

The divine values within the Pancasila axiology affirm that humans are dignified beings who cannot be treated as instruments of development. This means that indigenous Papuans are not obstacles to be eliminated for the sake of project efficiency. They are dignified human beings whose relationship with their land and forests has a deep spiritual dimension—a dimension even recognized in Article 43 of Law No. 2 of 2021 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua, which mandates the protection of customary rights in every development process.

If the Papua National Strategic Project (PSN) violates this value—if it reduces indigenous peoples to mere spectators on their own land—then it not only violates the law but also violates the fundamental values of Pancasila. However, this is a criticism of implementation, not of the constitutional mandate to build national food security.

2. Second Principle—Humanity: Free , Prior , and Informed Consent as a Constitutional Obligation

The Second Principle affirms just and civilized humanity. In the context of the Papua National Movement, this translates into legal and moral obligations: Free , Prior , and Informed Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)—the free, prior, and informed consent of indigenous peoples before any major decisions are made about their lands. Violations of FPIC are not merely procedural; they are violations of the humanitarian values upon which the state is founded.

The author's issue analysis (May 10, 2026) notes that one of the most powerful narratives in the film "Pesta Babi" is the absence of equal dialogue with indigenous communities before the project began. If this finding is accurate, it represents a serious axiological deficit that the government must address not by disbanding public discussion forums, but by opening a real dialogue. The disbandment of the film screening at Mataram University—as noted in the issue analysis—actually validates Streisand. Predicted effect : public curiosity increases, critical narratives spread further.

3. Third Principle—Unity: Papua is Indonesia, and Indonesia is Papua

The Third Principle demands unity that is not merely administrative, but substantive. Papua is not a colony exploited by the central government—it is an integral part of the national project that should enjoy the benefits of development equally. From this perspective, the National Strategic Project (PSN) for Papua has strong axiological legitimacy : the state is here to develop a region that has been left behind for decades.

But unity also means inclusivity . Programs developed without involving local communities as true partners—not simply policy objects—are not expressions of unity. They are a form of centralism that resembles the very structure they want to abandon. Soemitronomic provides guidance: Indonesia Incorporated means the state, state-owned enterprises, local cooperatives, and indigenous communities working in strategic coordination—not the state dominating in a manner reminiscent of colonial patterns.

4. Fourth Principle—Democracy: Indigenous Peoples as Holders of Local Sovereignty

The people-centered values within Pancasila axiology presuppose that power rests with the people—and in the Papuan context, the most relevant people are the indigenous people who have managed the land for hundreds of generations. Article 18B Paragraph 2 of the 1945 Constitution recognizes and respects the unity of indigenous legal communities and their traditional rights. This is not merely a formal legal norm—it is an axiological imperative of the Fourth Principle.

A constitutional National Strategic Project (PSN) must position indigenous communities as holders of local sovereignty—not mere recipients of compensation. This means a partnership model that gives indigenous communities real ownership in project management structures, a transparent and equitable profit-sharing scheme, and participation mechanisms that go beyond the formality of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Soemitro emphasized: "The legitimacy of development architecture depends on public involvement. Without it, policies risk losing their moral basis."

5. Fifth Principle—Social Justice: Who Enjoys the Surplus from Papua?

The Fifth Principle is the ultimate standard by which all policies are tested: who benefits from the surplus? This question is not rhetorical—it is a measurable, empirical indicator. What percentage of the Papua National Development Plan (PSN) workforce comes from local communities? What percentage of profits are retained in Papua? What percentage of the infrastructure built by the PSN also serves the needs of indigenous communities?

If the answers to these questions are disappointing, then the National Strategic Plan (PSN) has violated the Fifth Principle—and the government must correct this, not cover it up. However, if the PSN is designed with a just distribution mechanism, it is the most concrete instrument of the Fifth Principle's axiology: the state is there to ensure that the wealth of Papua's land does not flow abroad or to the Jakarta elite, but rather benefits the Papuan people who have been left behind.

Table 2: The Five Principles of Pancasila as the Standards for Testing Papua's National Strategic Projects

The Principles of Pancasila	Axiological Standards	Testing Constitutional National Strategic Project	PSN that Violates the Constitution
I — Divinity	Development honors, not degrades humans	A project that recognizes the spiritual dimension of indigenous peoples' relationship with the land.	Forced evictions that ignore the sacred value of ancestral land
II — Humanity	FPIC: free, prior, and fully informed consent	Equal dialogue before project commencement; fair and dignified compensation	Projects without consultation; indigenous peoples positioned as obstacles
III — Unity	Papua as a development partner, not an object of exploitation	Partnership scheme involving local communities as co-owners	Projects that drain surpluses out of Papua without local benefits
IV — Democracy	Indigenous communities as holders of local sovereignty	Indigenous community ownership in project management structures	PSN decisions without real participation of local communities

V — Social Justice	Surplus stays in Papua; local people enjoy the benefits	The majority of the workforce and supply chain involves local residents.	Added value flows to large corporations; Papua remains poor in a rich land
--------------------	---	--	--

A Critical and Balanced Reading of the Film "Pest Pig"

Legitimate Criticism and the Limits of Disproportionate Narrative

The film "Pesta Babi" by Watchdoc is a work of investigative journalism that has every right to exist, be watched, and be discussed in a democratic society. The most important statement to be made from this perspective is: President Prabowo and his government should be open to this criticism, not shut it down. Disbanding public screenings on campus is a response that is not only democratically wrong but also strategically counterproductive—exactly as analyzed in the report by Author: Streisand. The effect makes the film even more sought after.

But reading criticism critically also means identifying the limits of disproportionate narratives. There is a fundamental difference between: (a) criticizing the implementation of the National Strategic Project (PSN) for violating the rights of indigenous peoples—this is legitimate, important, and must be addressed; and (b) concluding that the entire vision of national food and energy security in Papua is colonialism—this is a generalization that ignores the broader geopolitical context and the state's constitutional right to development.

Soemitro once warned of the dangers of narratives that romanticize traditional conditions as a status quo that must be maintained: "Romanticizing traditional communities risks giving rise to policies that maintain the status quo, as if social stability is more important than economic transformation." A Papua that is poor in infrastructure, isolated, and dependent on central budget transfers is not a sovereign Papua. Transformation is necessary—the question is how.

Military Engagement: Reading in a Constitutional Context

One of the most pointed criticisms in the film and its discussion concerns the TNI's involvement in the Papua National Strategic Project, which is considered a deviation from its defense function. Reference to Law No. 34 of 2004 concerning the TNI forms the basis of this argument.

However, a complete constitutional reading must consider the context: first, Papua is a border region that has a real defense dimension—the presence of the military in the OMSP (Military Operations Other Than War) corridor to maintain the stability of the region which is a vital national project has a legal basis that cannot be simply denied; second, what needs to be criticized is not the military presence per se, but rather its accountability and oversight mechanisms; third, Soemitro, within the Soemitronomic framework, understands that the state has a function as a "Security Operator & Risk Absorber"—exactly as identified in the Design Thinking diagram (2026).

The government must respond to this criticism not defensively, but with transparency: explaining the specific role of the TNI, its oversight mechanisms, and how it ensures its presence does not intimidate civilians. The author's report recommends the formation of an independent evaluation team to review the governance of the Papua National Strategic Reserves Program (PSN)—a recommendation that should be welcomed, not rejected.

Deforestation and the Environment: A Soemitronomic Test of Sustainability

Reports of a 66 percent increase in deforestation in Papua by 2025 are serious allegations that require transparent, independent data verification. From a Soemitronomic perspective, Soemitro understands that "development that destroys ecological foundations is ultimately counterproductive"—it is not simply an environmental issue, but a long-term economic strategy issue.

Papua, with its third-largest tropical forest ecosystem in the world, is a strategic national asset in the era of the green economy and ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) which increasingly determine Indonesia's access to international financing. The author's analysis warns of the risk of international scrutiny from environmental NGOs, which could impact Indonesia's green diplomacy image. In the context of global Transcapital Power and Technology Power, which increasingly consider ESG as an investment standard, massive deforestation in Papua is not just a moral issue—it is a matter of Indonesia's geoeconomic position.

Therefore, the implementation of Papua's National Strategic Project (PSN) in accordance with Soemitronomics must require a rigorous and independent environmental impact analysis (EIA), not a formality. The downstreaming that Soemitro championed must be built on the foundation of a protected ecosystem, not on the ruins of a sacrificed forest.

Four Key Propositions

A critical-systematic literature review and cross-referential analysis yielded four main findings that collectively form the core contribution of this article.

1. Structural Isomorphism between Soemitronomics and Pancasila Axiology

Analytical mapping reveals a structural isomorphism—not merely a superficial similarity—between the pillars of Soemitronomics and the axiological principles of Pancasila. Each pillar of Soemitronomics corresponds directly to a specific dimension of one or more of the Pancasila principles, suggesting that Soemitro's economic thought was not constructed in opposition to Pancasila philosophy, but rather as a concrete operationalization of its development. This finding challenges the common academic framing that treats Soemitronomics as a purely technocratic -developmental discourse and Pancasila as a purely normative-philosophical discourse. The two are, in fact, co-constitutive: Pancasila provides axiological validation for each of Soemitronomic's interventions, while Soemitronomics provides strategic instrumentalization for each of Pancasila's values.

2. The \$165 Trillion Hegemony Challenge Is Structural, Not Cyclical

Geoeconomic analysis confirms that the three-pole hegemonic challenges facing Indonesia are structural—rooted in the global power architecture—rather than cyclical fluctuations that can be addressed through conventional macroeconomic stabilization. The combined power of \$165 trillion far exceeds Indonesia's GDP by a factor of approximately 55:1. Half-hearted reforms or market-oriented adjustments will not produce the structural transformation that Soemitronomics demands. This analysis validates Soemitro's warning : "Indonesia is a country vulnerable to economic sovereignty because it has betrayed the foundations and economic vision of the 1945 constitution" (Rizal et al., 2017). al. , 2026). A structural diagnosis requires a structural—not a symptomatic—response.

3. The Papua National Strategic Project (PSN) has strong constitutional legitimacy, but governance deficits have created serious axiological violations.

A content analysis of the constitutional and regulatory frameworks shows that the vision of the Papua National Strategic Project (PSN) as an instrument of food and energy sovereignty has strong legal legitimacy—based on Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 2 of 2021, and Presidential Regulation No. 109 of 2020 (Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 109 of 2020; the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia; Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2021). Simultaneously, however, findings from the issue analysis report regarding the absence of meaningful FPIC, the potential for unverified deforestation , and non-transparent military coordination mechanisms create a serious axiological deficit against Principles I, II, and IV of Pancasila (Author, 2026). These are two realities that must be held together: the legitimacy of the vision and the urgency of improving its implementation.

4. The PSN vs. Colonialism Comparative Narrative is Disproportionate but Reflects a Real Failure of Policy Communication

An analysis of 70 percent of the negative sentiments and narratives of the film "Pesta Babi" shows that public perceptions that frame the PSN as "new colonialism" reflect two things simultaneously: (a) a real failure in implementation that provides a factual basis for criticism; and (b) a failure in government policy communication that is unable to build a strong, value-based constitutional narrative about the urgency of national food and energy security (Author, 2026; Rizal et al. , 2026). These two dimensions must be responded to simultaneously.

Soemitronomics in the Context of the Papua Debate

The four findings above produce three substantive discussions that advance scholarship on Indonesian economic sovereignty and post-colonial development theory.

First, this synthesis demonstrates that the Soemitronomics -Pancasila framework constitutes what can be characterized as a normative theory of the developmental state—a theoretical contribution that goes beyond previous developmental state scholarship (Evans , 1995) by anchoring state-led development not merely in techocratic rationality but in a

coherent axiological system. While Evans' embedded While autonomy explains the institutional conditions that enable the state to effectively guide economic transformation, it remains agnostic about the normative goals of that transformation. The Soemitronomics - Pancasila synthesis fills this gap: its goal is the progressive realization of all five axiological values, with social justice as the ultimate criterion.

Second, the debate over Papua's National Strategic Project (PSN) reveals a more fundamental tension in post-colonial development theory: between the state's right to build domestic production capacity within its own territory and the rights of indigenous communities to the land and resource management they have exercised for generations. The Soemitronomics -Pancasila framework offers a way to transcend this apparent opposition: the state has a constitutional mandate to develop, and indigenous communities have a constitutional right to meaningful participation and equitable distribution of benefits. The two are not alternatives—they are components of a single Pancasila mandate that must be fulfilled simultaneously (Pramita et al. al., 2024; Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945).

Third, the analysis of the conditions for successful implementation shows that the difference between a constitutional PSN and an exploitative PSN lies not in the existence of the project itself, but rather in five operationalized governance quality variables: (1) the existence of meaningful FPIC; (2) an ownership scheme that guarantees the participation of indigenous communities; (3) a fair value-added distribution mechanism; (4) ecosystem protection through an independent AMDAL; and (5) a transparent military accountability mechanism. Thus, the public debate on the Papua PSN should focus on verifying and improving these five variables, rather than on the question of whether or not the PSN is a project (Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 109 of 2020; Pramita et al., 2024; Rizal et al., 2026).

Five Strategic Recommendations: Maintaining Vision, Improving Governance

The authors' report offers two response scenarios: Scenario A (Accommodative & Dialogic), which is highly recommended, and Scenario B (Defensive & Counter-Narrative), which carries medium-high risk. From the perspective of Soemitronomics and Pancasila axiology, Scenario A is not simply a political communication choice—it is a value choice that reflects the government's commitment to the principles that underpin its legitimacy. Here are five strategic recommendations built on this framework:

Recommendation 1: Equal Dialogue with Indigenous Communities as Non- Negotiable: The government must immediately ensure a real and meaningful FPIC mechanism for all indigenous communities affected by the Papua National Strategic Project (PSN). This is not merely legal compliance—it is an axiological obligation of the Second and Fourth Principles that cannot be compromised by calculations of project efficiency. As recommended in Scenario A of the Author's report: feature government officials who sit on equal footing and engage in direct dialogue with Papuan Indigenous Elders, not merely administrative representatives.

Recommendation 2: Reform the Ownership Scheme and Value-Added Distribution: The Papua National Project (PSN) must be restructured so that indigenous communities have real ownership stakes in the project management entity, rather than simply receiving one-time compensation. The indigenous cooperative model that participates in the production value chain is the most concrete manifestation of the values of the Fourth and Fifth Principles. This is Soemitronomics' choice : ensuring capital formation domestic with equitable distribution.

Recommendation 3: Transparency of Deforestation Data and Independent Environmental Audits: Governments should proactively publish accurate deforestation data and invite independent environmental audits—including from credible international NGOs. This transparency is not a weakness; it is the most effective defense strategy against unverified deforestation narratives . In the global ESG context, environmental transparency is a prerequisite for access to sustainable international finance.

Recommendation 4: Stop the Repression of Public Discussion Spaces: The disbandment of film screenings and intimidation of academic activities are counterproductive and unconstitutional. President Prabowo, as recommended by the author's report, should explicitly state that criticism is part of a healthy democracy. A strong government is one that is unafraid of discussion—not one that suppresses it. This is the axiological standard of the Fourth Principle.

Recommendation 5: A Strong Constitutional Narrative on Food and Energy Sovereignty: The government must build a cohesive, data-driven, and values-oriented narrative about why Papua's National Strategic Plan is a national imperative —not in corporate or bureaucratic language, but in the language of nationalism connected to the legacy of Soemitro's thought and the values of Pancasila. Food and energy sovereignty must be presented as the right of the Indonesian people, free from hostages to unstable global supply chains.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Soemitro Djojohadikusumo once asserted that "policies risk losing their moral basis" if implemented without meaningful public participation. This is not an argument for abandoning policies—rather, it is a command to improve how they are implemented. The vision of the Papua National Strategic Project (PSN) as an instrument of national food and energy sovereignty is constitutionally legitimate, geopolitically urgent, and socioeconomically sound . What must be fought for is their equitable implementation.

The film "Pig Party" and its accompanying critical narrative are a mirror that the government should look at with honesty, not reflexive defense. Not because every claim is accurate—empirical verification is still needed—but because the anger and concern behind it are real, and come from the very people it is designed to serve.

The axiology of Pancasila provides clear guidance: development is only legitimate if it humanizes (Principle II), unites (Principle III), involves the people as subjects, not objects (Principle IV), and distributes its benefits fairly (Principle V). A Papuan National

Development Plan (PSN) that passes all these tests is constitutionally and morally defensible. A Papuan National Development Plan (PSN) that fails any of these tests must be corrected—and that correction is an obligation, not an option.

President Prabowo has a strong intellectual legacy from his father. Soemitronomics teaches that a sovereign nation is one that builds its domestic capacity—including in Papua—in a dignified, just manner, and based on the values that make Indonesia worthy of being called a nation. These are standards that must be met, and they cannot be lowered for the sake of project speed or corporate interests.

A constitutional and dignified Papua National Development Plan (PSN) is the right of the Indonesian people—the people of 38 provinces who need national food and energy security. A Papua National Development Plan (PSN) that respects indigenous communities, protects ecosystems, and distributes their benefits fairly is the right of the Papuan people. The two are not contradictory—both are a single mandate of Pancasila that must be fulfilled simultaneously.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bhaskar , R. (1975). *A realist theory of science* . Leeds Books.
- Creswell , J. W. , & Poth , C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design : Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Design Thinking . (2026). *Defense vs. Domination Strategy: Sovereign × Transcapital × Technology Power* [Geopolitical and Geoeconomic Diagram].
- Evans , P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy : States and industrial transformation* . Princeton University Press.
- Frank, AG (1967). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.
- Kaelan. (2013). *Pancasila Nation State*. Paradigm.
- Laksono, D., & Dale, C. (Directors). (2026). *Pig Party: Colonialism in our time* [Documentary film]. Watchdoc.
- Mahally.ac.id. (nd.). *Philosophy of Science in Pancasila: A Study of Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology* . <https://mahally.ac.id>
- Nkrumah , K. (1965). *Neo- colonialism : The last stage of imperialism*. Nelson.
- Ostrom , E. (1990). *Governing the Commons* . Cambridge University Press.
- Author. (2026, May 10). *Issue analysis report on the film "Pest Pig"* [Issue analysis report].
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 109 of 2020 concerning the Acceleration of the Implementation of National Strategic Projects.
- Pramita, S., et al. (2024). Pancasila educational philosophy in the review of ontology, epistemology, and axiology. *Journal on Education* , 6 (2), 11038–11050.
- Prebisch , R. (1950). *The economics development of Latin America* . ECLA.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice* . Harvard University Press.

- Rizal, A., Haryono, Y., & Setiadi, D. (2026). *Soemitro Djojohadikusumo anti-colonialism: The turmoil of Indonesian political economic thought* [Main book].
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom* . Anchor Books.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology : An overview and guidelines . *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339.
- 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Article 18B Paragraph 2, Article 28H, Article 33.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2021 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua, Article 43.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 34 of 2004 concerning the Indonesian National Armed Forces.