

CULTURAL APPROPRIATION OF “PAPUAN PEOPLE” IN THE SELECTION OF THE AMBASSADOR FOR PON XX IN 2021

Genny Gustina Sari

Department of Communication Science, FISIP – Riau University

Author Correspondence: Genny.gustina@lecturer.unri.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The selection of the famous artist Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as PON XX ambassadors in Papua drew a lot of public criticism. The issue of cultural appropriation practice related to PB PON's decision to choose the artists to accompany Boaz Salossa who has been appointed as ambassador is getting wider. By using Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis method, this paper tries to see how the "orang Papua" is represented in the discourse of PON XX Papua. The results showed that Boaz Salossa as the XX PON ambassador was in fact only a subject who was seated to represent the "orang Papua" while Nagita and Raffi represented the PON event. Boaz Salossa is considered not representative enough to publish and promote the PON event, therefore Nagita and Raffi are considered needed. Reasoning cultural appreciation, in fact, the practice of cultural appropriation has occurred in the PON's ambassador selection. "Orang Papua" bears the burden of representation as primitive humans who cannot speak up and convey their own interests. Papuan culture is commodified on the basis of knowledge and power only for the benefit of the ruler. The event is not a form of cultural appreciation, yet a practice of cultural appropriation.

Keywords: *representation; papuans; PON XX; cultural appropriation.*

INTRODUCTION

The selection of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as Ambassadors or Icons of PON XX Papua 2021 brought mixed reactions from the public, including celebrities and public figures in Indonesia. The government's decision is very unfortunate for some Indonesian people because they are considered unable to accommodate the cultural diversity that exists in Indonesia. The comments that have sprung up point to the practice of cultural appropriation of the "orang Papua" culture. Does the question arise why are not Papuans chosen to be PON XX ambassadors such as Nowela Elizabeth Auparay, Lifni Sanders, Putri Nere, Olvah Bwefar Alhamid, or

Yuliana Fonataba who also have several achievements and are known to the public? Why should Nagita Slavina? Previously, the government had appointed Boaz Solossa as an ambassador for PON XX Papua, but recently the emergence of the figures of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad who are not “orang Papua” as icons of PON XX, has caused various polemics and questions in the community, especially for Papuans themselves.

The upload to the Instagram social media account @raffinagita1717 on April 4, 2021, wrote that the married couple Raffi Ahmad and Nagita Slavina were chosen to be the XX PON Icons accompanying Boaz Solossa who was chosen to be the XX Papua PON Ambassador. The problem arose when Nagita Slavina took a photo shoot using traditional Papuan clothes and posted stating that Nagita was the XX PON Ambassador inviting various comments from the public. Not only that, it was the first time that during the PON event there were the terms “icon” and “ambassador” at the same time at the XX PON event which was held in Papua in 2021 ago.



Picture 1. Raffi and Nagita's posts declare them as Icons of XX Papua PON

The post on the Instagram account @raffinagita1717 seems to emphasize the difference between an icon and an ambassador. The presence of Raffi Ahmad and Nagita Slavina as XX PON icons is not to get rid of Boaz Solossa's position but to accompany him in promoting the 2021 PON XX Papua event. Boaz Solossa, who also posed in the post, was considered to represent the “orang Papua” who seemed to have understood that the Papuan people were not replaced but accompanied by other people. Another question that then emerged was why should Boaz Solossa be accompanied by Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad. One of the uploads on the comic's Instagram @arie_kriting on June 2, 2021, highlighted the practice of Cultural Appropriation related to the appointment of Nagita Slavina as an ambassador or

PON XX icon. The icon will raise the issue of cultural appropriation where Papuan women are not well represented (source: Instagram @arie_kriting 2 June 2021). Arie Kriting's statement is also not the best solution when the term "icon" is changed to "friend". Because basically, it is not a term that is disputed by the Indonesian people, especially "orang Papua" but the presence of the figures of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad who accompanied Boaz Solossa as ambassadors for PON XX Papua.

Similar issues can also be seen in the post of the @gyozagonza (Insos Byak) account which wrote *"cuz there's no more West Papuan women to represent their own culture huh. Appropriation is not beautiful..."* Furthermore, Inyos Byak's account explains the difference between cultural appreciation and cultural appropriation and considers the selection of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as XX PON icons as a form of cultural appropriation (source: Instagram @gyozagonza 10 June 2021). Some of the capital's artists were also seen to support Arie Kriting's statement such as Dian Sastrowardoyo, Augie Fantinus, Hanung Bramantyo, Happy Salma, Hannah Al Rashid and so on (source: Instagram: @arie_kriting 2 June 2021). It did not stop there, the Head of the Implementation Team for the Defense Industry Policy Committee (KKIP), Johannes Surya Prabowo, asked three questions regarding the appointment of Nagita and Raffi as ambassadors or icons of PON XX; 1) why not Papuans or at least those who live in Papua? 2) why not athletes and "must be beautiful"? 3) why not people who understand Papuan culture? (Alimudin, 2021). In her Twitter account, Veronica Koman (@VeronicaKoman), a lawyer and human rights activist in Papua, also commented, *"Beginilah proyek penjajah. Heboh bikin PON di Papua, tapi dutanya tetep orang Jakarta. Kek gak ada manusia di Papua. Gunakan budaya dan tanahnya, tembak mati dan tangkap orang-orangnya"* (Putri, 2021).

The use of the terms "icon" and "ambassador" later became a separate polemic. Even though Raffi Ahmad has clarified that they were appointed as icons, not ambassadors for PON XX, in fact it does not relieve the issue of cultural appropriation that has already developed in the community. Apart from the terms "icon" and "ambassador" which are considered as defenses from the government and Raffi Ahmad himself, the question of why the figures of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad who are not "orang Papua" should be representatives for the XX PON which will be held in Papua in 2021 still unanswered. In the Big Indonesian Dictionary, "ambassador" means a person who is sent by the government or represents a country to administer or perform special tasks for the interest of the country he represents, while "icon" means a painting, picture, or symbol on wood or a computer panel that symbolizes something (<https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>). Simplified, the term ambassador refers to "people" while the term icon refers to "things". Then how can people represent the icon for PON XX? Further details about this will be discussed in the discussion section.

The image of "orang Papua" so far has been shown to be no better than "orang Jawa" both in terms of culture, values, and skin color. We can see how the "orang Papua" is represented on various occasions in various media. In the soap opera *Diam-Diam Suka*, for example, the ethnic identity of Papua is given a low value as the other for this nation. Papua is shown as a stupid, strange, and primitive figure (Christiani, 2017). In the film *Lost in Papua*, we can see how the media plays a big role in showing racial stereotypes where the film represents Papuans as primitive

humans (Larasati & others, 2014). From a political point of view, "orang Papua" is always presented as commoners whose interests must be fought for by the elite. The elites tried to represent the interests of the people but in reality, the special autonomy they had fought for never showed results, "orang Papua" remained left behind, marginalized, and could not speak out (Lefaan et al., 2012). Instead of being positioned as the center of the process in the era of development, "orang Papua" is in fact positioned on the edge of the arena and are discriminated against. Papuans do not feel the benefits of development, their desire to maintain nationalism and culture is considered a form of resistance to the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, "orang Papua" are encouraged to follow patterns and currents that are oriented towards the center of the country, namely the island of Java. The failure of development has only fostered the Papuan people's distrust of the Indonesian government, which they have expressed with various rejections, and apathy towards government programs (Supriyono, 2014).

Land-grabbing efforts in Papua are seen as a form of economic marginalization with two meanings, namely as a mechanism to make Papua a part of the territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia and as a consequence for Papua because it is part of Indonesia. Not only that, cultural killings and the destruction of kinship ties in Papua between groups who choose to fight for justice for Papuans who are discriminated against and groups who believe themselves to be part of Indonesia even though they have not received the justice they dream of cannot be avoided (Savitri, 2020). It's not just an issue, but we can indeed see how the position of "orang Papua" as part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia has always felt like they were stepchildren by their own people. Opportunities to develop and voice their interests are often biased and intertwined with elite power and interests. The election for the implementation of PON XX in Papua is also considered a form of government concern that has finally been ignored for a long time now being promoted through the XX PON event. But do the "orang Papua" really want that? Are the needs and voices of the Papuan people being realized or are the voices of the dominant group who feel they have represented the interests and voices of the "orang Papua"?

The issue of cultural appropriation brings the author to recall the study conducted by Hooks (2006) in his paper entitled *Eating the Other* which states that when race and ethnicity become commodities as a resource for pleasure, the culture of certain groups and the individual body can be seen as a playground for the different races. dominate. Eating the other itself refers to efforts to "eat" other cultures in order to improve the taste of one's own culture. Racial and ethnic minorities are seen as a food that the dominant race desires. Even though it is wrapped in "cultural appreciation" packaging, for Hook, the effort to commodify the other's culture is nothing more than an effort to cultural appropriation (Hooks, 2006). James O Young identifies the disadvantage of cultural appropriation, namely the violation of property rights which refers to the confiscation or theft and the second is an attack on the survival or cultural identity of its members. In the end, cultural appropriation has the potential to expose members of cultural groups to discrimination, poverty, and lack of opportunities (Young, 2009). Cultural appropriation itself can be placed into four categories, namely exchange, domination, exploitation, and transculturation.

Transculturation, for example, places culture as a relational phenomenon formed by acts of dispossession either directly or indirectly (Rogers, 2006). Some experts see that cultural appropriation is practiced through acculturation and cultural assimilation. Cultural appropriation is a change or movement which of course can be recognized because it is accompanied by a metacultural discourse in which the represented groups do not agree and feel disadvantaged from efforts to appropriate their culture (Jackson, 2021).

The problem of cultural appropriation is in fact closely related to how minority cultural groups are represented. "Orang Papua", so far, seems as if they are not allowed to speak and are given space to speak. Dominant cultural groups which coincidentally also hold power have replaced the position of "orang Papua" to voice their desires and dreams so that resistance which then emerges to the surface is considered a form of evil. Cultural appropriation identifies two problems that arise in cultural engagement, namely the occurrence of cultural violations and misrepresentation (Lenard & Balint, 2020). Gayatri Spivak in the writing *Can the subaltern speak?* Seeing how Sati's ritual practice is proof that the subaltern group can never voice their own will. As a minority group, subalterns are never placed as objects that can represent themselves but need to be represented. But in reality, as the object being discussed, often their interests are never really voiced, instead, the interests of those who represent them are conveyed (Spivak, 1988). "Orang Papua" is a subaltern, a minority group as well as "the other" represented by the dominant group.

Norman Fairclough through his thoughts attempts to combine social theory (discourse) with linguistics to see how power relations are built behind the text and how ideological power is textually articulated. This is of course closely related to the main problem that the author described above, how power relations are practiced through texts, discursive practices, and social practices. Fairclough defines discourse in three ways; first, discourse is defined as the use of language as a social practice; second, discourse is defined as a kind of language used in a particular field, and third, discourse is used to refer to ways of speaking that give meaning to experiences from a certain perspective. Furthermore, Fairclough states that discourse is a form of social practice that constructs the social world, identity, and social relations.

According to Fairclough, the discourse has three functions, namely the identity function which emphasizes the role of discourse in constructing the social identity of community members. The relational function is related to the existence of discourse that functions to create social relations in society that are adapted to social identity. And the third function, namely the ideational function, refers to the role of discourse in constructing knowledge and beliefs that become a source of reference for people to interpret the world, social identity, and social relations. In his discourse analysis, Fairclough offers a three-dimensional model that represents three domains, namely text (speech, writing, visual image, or a combination of the three), discursive practices that include the production and consumption of texts and social practices (Munfarida, 2014: 4-6)

Fairclough also formulated another important concept, namely intertextuality which affirms the interrelation of various texts and discourses in a text. When power and ideology are embedded in discourse, intertextuality will act as a mechanism to maintain or change the domination relation. Discursive practices take place without

realizing it so that the subject perceives it as normal or natural and even tends to think it is true. However, subjects do not really lose their agency because they basically have a critical reflective capacity to question discursive practices and ideologies.

Cultural appropriation comes in various forms, various types of actions that must be analyzed case by case with various consequences (Arya, 2021). We cannot beat every problem related to the cultural appropriation that occurs in Indonesia. What kinds of cultural actions and cultural products are being confiscated and what kind of losses will the "orang Papua" bear in the future? This paper will discuss how the "orang Papua" is actually represented in the discourse on the election of ambassadors or icons for PON XX Papua 2021, and is it true that the practice of cultural appropriation has occurred and what is its form? Is the effort to organize a national event in Papua which is considered a form of national unity and integrity a camouflage to strengthen the supremacy of group power and dominant culture in Indonesia? And the long record of the nation's history about how so far the "orang Papua" have been represented also needs to be reviewed, is it true that so far the voices of the "orang Papua" have been represented or are only efforts to disguise cultural appropriation.

METHODOLOGY

This study focuses on the practice of representing "orang Papua" in the discourse on the election of ambassadors and icons for PON XX Papua 2021. The appointment of non-Papuan as icons to accompany PON ambassadors who are Papuan is considered a form of cultural appropriation. By analyzing discourses in the mass media, both online news and social media, which highlight this issue, the author uses Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis method where discourse is a form of social practice that constructs the social world, identity, and social relations. Combining interpretive, linguistic, and sociological traditions, Fairclough offers a discourse model that contains three dimensions, namely text, discursive practice, and social practice (Fairclough, 2013).

In analyzing the three dimensions above, Fairclough offers a different type of analysis. In the text area, description is used to analyze the text to get an idea of how the text is presented. The second type of analysis, namely interpretation, is used to analyze how the text is consumed and interpreted by the reader, in this case, the interpretation is divided into interpretations of the text and its contextual situation. The third stage of analysis is the explanation to describe discourse as part of social practice and show the determination of discourse on social structures and their reproductive effects on these structures. The social structures that become the focus of the analysis are power relations. The social processes and practices that become the focus are processes and practices of social struggle (Munfarida, 2014: 9-10).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The meaning of "icon" and "ambassador" is blurred in the discourse of PON XX Papua

When issues regarding the practice of cultural appropriation have occurred since the election of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as Ambassadors or Icons of

the XX Papua PON 2021, the polemic regarding the terms “ambassador” and “icon” became a public discussion. “orang Papua” were incensed, considering the government’s actions to be overreaching. Voices of resistance to this decision did not only come from Papuans, but also various human rights activists who also felt that the practice of cultural appropriation was taking place at the XX Papua PON event. Referring to the definition in the Big Indonesian Dictionary, of course, we can see that Icon refers to “goods” while ambassador refers to “people”. If we trace in the history of PON, the term Duta refers to certain individuals or groups who are tasked with promoting and being the face of PON itself, while the term icon refers more to the mascot and logo used during PON.

Boaz Solossa is rightly positioned as an ambassador for PON XX, namely Papuans who were chosen as representatives to represent and promote the PON XX event. The assumption that the Papua XX PON event will be more successful with the presence of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad who were appointed as XX PON icons caused a lot of disappointment. The government in power in this case PB PON hurt the feelings of the people and “orang Papua”. Social practices in society have determined the position of Raffi Ahmad and Nagita Slavina who are considered far superior to Boaz Solossa (richer, more famous, and well-known, Javanese people who are known to be superior to other races in Indonesia) are representative enough to “sell” the XX PON event. this Papua. PB PON prioritizes the interests of the authorities and the economy for the success of the XX PON event even though it has to sacrifice the feelings of the “orang Papua” themselves. Boaz Solossa is not in a position to put up resistance in the maelstrom of power. In addition to the burden of representation as “the other” in society, Boaz Solossa is also not as famous as Raffi Ahmad and Nagita Slavina, is not rich, and cannot bargain. Boaz Solossa is an iconic tool itself that cannot voice the interests of “orang Papua”.

Looking back, the terms ambassador and icon at the PON event never existed at the same time, in 2016 Former Miss Indonesia 2011 Maria Selena was appointed as the Ambassador of PON XIX West Java. Maria Selena, who was born in Palembang at that time, did not experience any problems when she was appointed as the PON ambassador in West Java. In 2012 PON XVIII which was held in Riau appointed Riau Students as ambassadors regardless of the origin or birth of the students. But what is interesting, of course, in the discourse of PON XX Papua is the emergence of the iconic term that is presented to accompany the figure of the PON Ambassador simultaneously as if it shows the inability of Boaz Salossa as the PON ambassador in representing the face of the PON to be held. As stated by the Head of Division II PB PON, Roy Letlora in an interview with reporters explaining that the appointment of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as XX PON Icons is solely for accelerating publications and marketing strategies by considering that the two artists have the power to mobilize the public. The duties and functions of the icon in this regard are also not much different from the PON ambassadors, namely both publishing and promoting the XX Papua PON activities in 2021 (Kristianto, 2021).

In Roy Letlora’s statement, there was an element of distrust towards the figure of Boaz Salossa who had been appointed as the XX PON Ambassador in promoting

and publicizing PON activities. The presence of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad is considered more capable of supporting PON activities than Boaz. The terms icon and ambassador here are vague. With duties and functions that can be said to be not much different, the government does not refer to the definitions of ambassadors and icons that have been standardized in the Big Indonesian Dictionary. The presence of Boaz as an ambassador is considered to represent the face of PON XX Papua, it feels like a live mascot that shows "orang Papua" not the PON event.

Boaz Salossa, if we draw from the definition of ambassador and icon here, it is more precisely positioned as an icon. A male footballer from Papua who represents "orang Papua" is not the voice of Papua. Physically, Boaz has been made a mascot. The color of the skin and its appearance are enough to explain and confirm that the XX PON will be held in Papua. If we see how the choice of the term "icon" and "ambassador" in PON XX is a concrete manifestation of what Bell Hook wrote in his article on eating the other. The appointment of Boaz Salossa as the PON ambassador is a form of cultural appreciation from a big event organized by PB PON. Boaz Salossa as an ambassador is a figure who represents the culture, face, and values of Papua and must be assisted by Raffi Ahmad and Nagita Slavina who were appointed as PON icons. Raffi Ahmad and Nagita Slavina as icons are tasked with supporting the performance of Boaz's function as PON ambassadors. The point is that the presence of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad does not seem to influence the representation of culture and the "orang Papua" who have been represented by Boaz Salossa.

However, as Hooks (2006) says and the author observes, the use of the term icon or "friend of the ambassador" as proposed by Arie Kriting to reduce the issue of cultural appropriation is a futile act. The term icon or ambassador's friend is only a camouflage to cover an ongoing cultural appropriation practice. This shows that there is no good intention to change the stigma of "orang Papua" that has been formed so far. The appointment of Raffi Ahmad and Nagita Slavina as PON icons is seen as an effort to highlight the dominant group culture, forever "orang Papua" will continue to bear the burden of representation as a minority primitive group in Indonesia. "Orang Papua" must forever be represented in the positions that have been prepared.

The resistance shown by the "orang Papua" is considered an attempt to divide the unity. C. Thi Nguyen and Matthew Strohl (2019) offer an understanding that a common understanding to form intimacy between each culture will prevent us from potential divisions in cultural appropriation through appropriation claims where minority groups can ask dominant groups to refrain from seizing certain elements in their culture to do not destroy the intimacy formed (2019). However, the author sees that this is difficult to realize as long as the "orang Papua" as a minority group or subaltern group are never allowed to represent themselves in discursive practices and social practices in society. Intimacy can only last as long as the cultural elements of each group do not touch each other, and as long as the dominant group does not feel that the voice of the Papuan people is sufficiently represented by them. However, in social practice, especially in the XX Papua PON event, cultural appropriation is unavoidable.

“Orang Papua” in a discourse of power

Stuart Hall elaborates on Michael Foucault’s understanding and then sees discourse as a system of representation. Knowledge is born from how humans understand themselves in their culture and how knowledge is produced in different periods, meaning that according to Hall, history is something that must be considered because that is where meaning comes from. Discourse produces language that produces knowledge which is then validated through power. Human behavior is then regulated through knowledge that has been authorized by power. The subject in this case can be anywhere as long as it produces meaning and has an effect, essentially the subject is in the discourse itself and discourse will only be understood as long as the audience or reader submits and occupies the position that has been provided in the discourse (Hall, 1997).

The discrimination that has been felt by “orang Papua” is a very deep wound. The government’s efforts as the dominant group in power to treat these wounds through the implementation of the XX PON which was held in Papua were tarnished by the election of the PON XX icon from the Javanese race to accompany Boaz Solossa as a Papuan. The practice of power practiced in the election of ambassadors and icons of PON XX Papua has placed Boaz Salossa as a passive object. The products of power, in this case, are the PON event itself which regulates and monopolizes anyone who will fill the position of the subject to be represented. Boaz Salossa was not chosen by “orang Papua”, he was chosen because of his status as Papuans who is considered to represent the faces of “orang Papua”, not representing the PON itself. The presence of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as other subjects is positioned to represent and promote the PON event. PB PON considers that they know better who is more worthy and more worthy to represent the real face of PON and Boaz Salossa is a subject whose function is to simply pacify “orang Papua” in the name of cultural appreciation.

Papuans are identified as people who come from the island of Papua, have a Melanesian physical appearance, have a primitive lifestyle, and are predominantly Christian (Andinata, 2022). These points represent the position of “orang Papua” as a minority in Indonesia. The discourse of “orang Papua” which has been considered primitive through various products of power such as Film, Drama, Political Policy, Law, and Legislation has produced statements that are not much different so that their interests must be represented. In the case of the election of ambassadors and icons of PON XX, we can see that Boaz Salossa is only a subject who bears the burden of representation that has been attached so far. Boaz is nothing more than a product of a powerful practice that ostensibly tries to represent all “orang Papua” but is never actually allowed to speak. Boaz Salossa is a “Papuan person” whose interests are not discussed. Through power, there are also rules that bind one’s behavior to submit and obey in the name of unity and unity.

The emergence of cultural appropriation issues related to the selection of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as the icons of XX PON has caused a wave of resistance from the community. At least 11 722 people have signed a petition to remove Nagita Slavina from being an ambassador for XX PON, on behalf of all Indonesian people who reject the practice of cultural appropriation at PON XX Papua. The petition aims

to make all the people of United Indonesia fight for the existence of Papuan culture and people who are not represented by the figure of Nagita Slavina (Sari, 2021). Resistance in this case refers to efforts to maintain the existence of minority groups, creating disorder in an order. The opposition to the position of the silent and voiceless subject in the discourse on the election of ambassadors and the icon of PON shows the existence of a contested culture, debated in the concept of overlapping order between interests and knowledge. Power relations depend on the meaning system embodied in culture, resistance to practices, and discourses that are deemed inappropriate to disrupt the line between power and knowledge (Merry, 1998). Another form of resistance also came from Papuan students who held a demonstration on June 11, 2021, rejecting the decision of PB PON to appoint Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as ambassadors or icons of PON in front of the KONI head office, the issue of cultural appropriation is still the main theme brought up by these students (Lesmana, 2021).



Picture 2. Papuan Student Demonstration in Front of the Central KONI Building 11 June 2021

The next question that is also interesting to discuss is about the limitations of cultural appropriation itself. According to Thi Nguyen and Strohl (2019), normative restrictions regarding cultural appropriation are based on independent considerations such as how much property rights are seized and how much loss is incurred. Intimacy considerations are used as the basis for normative restrictions through appropriation claims. Appropriation claims are efforts made by non-members of certain groups to be able to refrain from forcibly taking the values and culture of other groups. In this case, PB PON has violated the appropriation claim by appointing Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad as icons of XX Papua PON. Considerations of "orang Papua" who have culture are not accommodated. As the author has explained, the determination of Boaz Salossa as an ambassador is only to fill the position of the subject that has been provided, to represent the "orang Papua".

Although PB PON stated that the appointment of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad was not a form of cultural appropriation, referring to the forms of cultural appropriation put forward by James O Young (2000) it is clear that in the discourse on the selection of ambassadors or icons of PON XX Papua, there has been a practice of cultural appropriation. Of the five forms of cultural appropriation, namely mate-

rial appropriation, non-material appropriation, stylistic appropriation, appropriation motifs, and subject appropriation, we can find at least two of the five forms of cultural appropriation. In terms of stylistic appropriation and motive appropriation, the resulting works are taken from the elements or styles of the original culture and then claimed to be a new culture inspired by the original culture. Just look, for example, how the Papuan traditional clothes worn by Nagita Slavina, namely Sali's clothes, do not represent the real Papuan culture at all. By using Papuan materials and patterns, Nagita Slavina wears "Papuan" attributes with a more modern model that is not at all similar to the original Papuan clothes.



Picture 3. Nagita Slavina Using Papuan Traditional Clothes for XX PON Photographs

However, the practice of cultural appropriation that occurs in the discourse on selecting ambassadors or icons for PON XX Papua is an attempt to seize the subject that should be tasked with representing not only a national event but also its culture and nation. It is not a subject that is marginalized and silent and then replaced with another subject that seems to voice the interests of the dominant group, in this case, the "orang Papua" culture. Hooks (2006) in his article states the need for the presence of a dominant and subordinate mutual recognition. Race should be viewed only as a device, nothing more and nothing less so that there is no longer any dominance between the two sides. It is time for "orang Papua" to represent their own culture and values, and voice their own desires and interests. no longer marginalized as a silent and represented subject. The practice of cultural appropriation is unavoidable. The desire of the dominant group to dominate the minority group by using their cultural objects regardless of the cultural context will continue to occur (Hsiao-Cheng, 2019). Efforts by the dominant group to "represent" the minority group without asking for their approval create stereotypes and of course have a very bad impact on minority groups. The cultural appropriation must ultimately be based on considerations of oppression that occur (Matthes, 2019). We can no longer get hung up on efforts to cover up looting in the guise of establishing "intimacy" between cultures and ignore the voices of "orang Papua" who have never represented themselves so far.

CONCLUSION

The practice of cultural appropriation, which has been wrapped in cultural ap-

preciation, should be abandoned. In the discourse on the election of ambassadors or icons for PON XX which will be held in Papua in 2021, it is a silent witness to how power and knowledge still produce meanings that position "orang Papua" as passive and marginalized subjects. The burden of representation attached to the "orang Papua" seems to never disappear or change. Boaz Salossa, who was appointed as an ambassador for PON XX, is in fact only a subject who is placed in a position to represent the "orang Papua". Meanwhile, Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad are considered far more representative than Boaz to publish and promote the XX PON event in Papua. The selection of the venue for the XX PON in Papua and the selection of Boaz Salossa as the PON ambassador are the government's efforts to cover up the practice of cultural appropriation under the guise of cultural appreciation.

The resistance carried out by the community in the form of protests in the media or in direct protests to the signing of a petition demanding the government cancel the appointments of Nagita Slavina and Raffi Ahmad will be considered an effort to divide the nation's unity. The practice of power will regulate people's behavior and we are just waiting to see whether this resistance will bear fruit or whether the "orang Papua" will forever be the subject represented in any discourse in the future.

The author sees a very small possibility of realizing cultural appreciation as long as minority groups in this case "orang Papua" are still represented through the viewpoints and interests of the rulers and dominant groups. The XX PON event, of course, prioritizes economic and political interests, although it is undeniable that the selection step for the implementation of XX PON in Papua on the one hand shows the face of Papua to other cultures and the world. Not only land, but even Papuan culture is also part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. The big and heavy task of the rulers is to be able to embrace and prove that the "orang Papua" is part of the Indonesian nation without being tainted by the interests of the rulers in the form of cultural appropriation.

The author realizes that this paper has not been able to present an appropriate solution in dealing with the problem of the representation of "orang Papua" as a minority group in Indonesia, but at least the author hopes that this article can be used as a reference to see that the problem of cultural appropriation has great potential to divide the nation. Firm actions and wider opportunities are needed for minority groups in Indonesia in this paper, the "orang Papua" to be able to represent themselves without being represented by others.

REFERENCES

- Alimudin, Rulfi. (2021). Nagita Slavina Didaulat jadi Duta PON XX Papua, Suryo Prabowo Beri Tiga Pertanyaan Menohok. <https://bekasi.pikiran-rakyat.com/nasional/pr-121986457/nagita-slavina-didaulat-jadi-duta-pon-xx-papua-suryo-prabowo-beri-tiga-pertanyaan-menohok?page=2>
- Andinata, M. (2022). Politik Representasi Identitas Papua Dalam Bingkai Pemberitaan Surat Kabar Kedaulatan Rakyat. *Komunika*, 18(1), 1-12.
- Arya, R. (2021). Cultural appropriation: What it is and why it matters?. *Sociology Compass*, 15(10), e12923.
- Christiani, L. C. (2017). Representasi Identitas Etnis Papua Dalam Serial Drama Remaja Diam-Diam Suka. *Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Kajian Media*, 1(1), 15-30. <https://doi.org/http://>

- dx.doi.org/10.31002/jkkm.v1i1.387
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Taylor & Francis. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=3djbAAAAQBAJ>
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. SAGE Publications. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=Vs-BdyhM9JEC>
- Hsiao-Cheng (Sandrine) Han (2019) Moving From Cultural Appropriation to Cultural Appreciation, *Art Education*, 72:2, 8-13, DOI: 10.1080/00043125.2019.1559575
- Hooks, B. (2006). Eating the Other: Desire and Resistance. In *Media and Cultural Studies* (pp. 366–380). Blackwell Publishing.
- Jackson, J. B. (2021). On Cultural Appropriation. *Journal of Folklore Research*, 58(1), 77-122.
- Kristianto, Kevin Topan. (2021). Mengenal Perbedaan Duta dan Ikon Yang Bikin Nagita Slavina jadi Sorotan di PON XX Papua. <https://www.kompas.com/sports/read/2021/06/06/15300078/mengenal-perbedaan-duta-dan-ikon-yang-bikin-nagita-slavina-jadi-sorotan-di?page=all>
- Larasati, C. E., & others. (2014). Representasi Identitas Etnis Papua Dalam Film Lost In Papua. *Commonline Departemen Komunikasi*, 3(3), 488–497. http://journal.unair.ac.id/COMN@table_of_content_137_volume3_nomor3.html
- Lefaan, A., Nugroho, H., & others. (2012). Etnosentrisme dan Politik Representasi di Era Otonomi Khusus Papua. *Majalah Ilmiah Pembelajaran*. <https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/mip/article/view/2801>
- Lenard, P. T., & Balint, P. (2020). What is (the wrong of) cultural appropriation?. *Ethnicities*, 20(2), 331-352.
- Lesmana, Agung Shandy. (2021). Mahasiswa Papua Geruduk Kantor KONI, Protes Nagita Slavina Jadi Ikon PON XX. <https://www.suara.com/news/2021/06/11/165220/mahasiswa-papua-geruduk-kantor-koni-prot-es-nagita-slavina-jadi-ikon-pon-xx?page=all>.
- Matthes, E. H. (2019). Cultural appropriation and oppression. *Philosophical Studies*, 176(4), 1003-1013.
- Munfarida, E. (2014). Analisis wacana kritis dalam perspektif Norman Fairclough. *KOMUNIKA: Jurnal Dakwah Dan Komunikasi*, 8(1), 1-19.
- Merry, S. E. (1998). Law, culture, and cultural appropriation. *Yale JL & Human.*, 10, 575. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/yallh10&div=28&id=&page=>
- Thi Nguyen, C., & Strohl, M. (2019). Cultural appropriation and the intimacy of groups. *Philosophical Studies*, 176(4), 981-1002. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-018-1223-3>
- Putri, Eka Alisa. (2021). Kegiatan Raffi Ahmad dan Nagita Slavina Sebagai Ikon PON XX Papua “Disemprot” Veronika Koman. <https://www.pikiran-rakyat.com/olahraga/pr-011978741/kegiatan-raffi-ahmad-dan-nagita-slavina-sebagai-duta-pon-xx-papua-disemprot-veronica-koman>
- Rogers, R. A. (2006). From cultural exchange to transculturation: A review and reconceptualization of cultural appropriation. *Communication Theory*, 16(4), 474–503. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00277.x>
- Sari, Janlika Putri Indah. (2021). 11.722 Orang teken Petisi, Copot Nagita Slavina Jadi Duta PON Papua. <https://kabar24.bisnis.com/read/20210610/15/1403658/11722-orang-teken-petisi-copot-nagita-slavina-jadi-duta-pon-papua>
- Savitri, L. A. (2020). Menegarakan Tanah dan Darah Papua. *Wacana Jurnal Transformasi Sosial Nomor*, 38.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak? In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271–313). http://www.mcgill.ca/files/crclaw-discourse/Can_the_subaltern_speak.

pdf

- Supriyono, J. (2014). Diskursus Kolonialistik dalam Pembangunan di Papua: Orang Papua dalam Pandangan Negara. *Jurnal Ultima Humaniora*, 2(1), 59–78. https://www.aifis-digilib.com/uploads/1/3/4/6/13465004/jurnal_humaniora_vol_ii_no_1_maret_2014.pdf
- Young, J. O. (2000). The Ethics of Cultural Appropriation. *Dalhousie Review*, 80, 301–316. <https://dalspace.library.dal.ca/bitstream/handle/10222/63438/dalrevvol80is-s3pp301316.pdf?sequence=1>
- Young, J. O. (2009). *The Ethics of Cultural Appropriation*. Wiley-Blackwell.