The Social Sciences 13 (1): 26-34, 2018
ISSN: 1818-5800

Responding to the New Challenges of Independent and Active Foreign Policy

[1]Yanyan M. Yani, [1]Tuti W. Irman and [2]Agus Haryanto
[1]Department of International Relations, Padjajaran University, Bandung, Indonesia
[2]Department of International Relations, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto, Indonesia

Abstract: Since, its independence, Indonesia has sough to take a long and challenging journey on its foreign policy. Regardless the regime that is in power there has always been a silver lining on the characteristic of Indonesia foreign policy embedded in its spirit of independent and active foreign policy. In a more contemporary setting this characteristic is further contested by the new internal and external challenges that include the country's excursion to uncharted reformasi process as well as the shifting of global power configuration. There are ample refreshed aspiration and demand both by internal and external players for Indonesia to play a world role. This study explores the true brand of Indonesia foreign policy and how it interacts with today's both internal and external challenges. The study underlines, among others that both internal and external environment have opened up a new possibility for Indonesia to play a major role in the international arena. However, Indonesia's worldview will predictably fall short to this new expectation, if there are lacks of capacity and leverage. This study, further, argues that there is an urgent need to nurture and strengthen the aspiration of Indonesia's world role and to live up to the expectation and come up with an intelligent response for the benefit for our people. In this process, Ministry of Foreign Affairs should play a critical role.

Key words: Foreign policy, shifting, global powers, challenges and international politics, affairs, ministry

INTRODUCTION

"Like it or not, Indonesia is back on the global map. Jakarta may become Southeast Asia's Dominant Center of Power and Influence".

After decades of reform process, we have witnessed a high expectation in our global role. The relatively smooth transition process of democracy has undoubtedly further enhanced the country's profile in the international stage as the third largest democracy where Islam, modernity and democracy can blend comfortably. The country also keenly engages in the front-line deliberations on various global issues from anti corruption to human right from climate change to financial reform.

This refreshed expectation is shared by domestic stakeholder as well as international partners. The general view is that democracy has achieved a point of no return and transformed the country into a progressive force in the international arena (Retno, 2009a). President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono put a high hope on the country's external affairs by saying that "Foreign policy has a critical role in my administration" (Susilo, 2005) and Indonesia must have a global vision since having a regional vision is not enough (Susilo, 2009). Meanwhile, the nation's new internationalist drive is very much welcomed by external stakeholders who, among other, envisage Indonesia's important place in international affairs that its size and geographical position have long merited.

Apart from its contemporary context, the country's notion for a global role is nothing new for the country's long journey in its conduct for an independent and active foreign policy. The concept reflected in the metaphor "rowing between two reefs" was introduced by the vice presidents Mohammad Hatta at the Central National Commission meeting on September 2, 1948. As the cold war began to evolve in the late 1940's, Indonesia refused to take sides and the term "rowing" suggested an active but hard and difficult journey or path for the country in external engagement (Bandoro, 2006).

The chosen part has served best the country's interest in the following decades and it enables Indonesian to take a full of pride in its diplomatic heritage, such as hosting the historical Asia Africa conference in 1955 and active involvement in the peace settlement in Cambodia and the Southern Philippines. The country is also undeniably the key founding member of ASEAN and maintained a pivotal role in North-South Dialogue.

Considering this strong diplomatic legacy, it is interesting to explore how the spirit of independent and active foreign policy finds its place in the new

Corresponding Author: Yanyan M. Yani, Department of International Relations, Padjajaran University, Bandung, Indonesia

Milieu. Would it spirit and its strong legacy merely take its new form as a style in the conduct of foreign policy? Could the spirit be substantiated to live up to the expectation of Indonesia's global role?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research uses qualitative research. This research involves both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data includes interview transcripts, relevant indexes and indicators, laws and regulations policy documents, proceeding of conferences and speeches. The text analysed includes policy documents and statements considered to be official versions. Then, the secondary data includes scholar's research publications.

Then, to provide deeper information, this research conducted interview with relevant people. The use of triangulation is inevitable, considering the need to highlight the causal path from the independet to dependent variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Indonesian foreign policy; from "rowing between two reefs" to "Navigating a turbulent ocean": The year following the declaration of independence in 1945 was indeed a critical period of Indonesia's soul searching in its foreign policy. The 1945 constitution spelled out Indonesia's opposition to colonialism and mandated the country's support for every nation's right to be independent. It also commanded Indonesia to play an active role to contribute to the establishment of world order based on the value of independence, peace and social justice. As the world war entering the Cold War era in the late 1940's and the new nation had to set it foot in the global discourse of alignment policy, those constitution's mandates rightly provided guidance for Indonesia to conduct its external affairs.

In those early year of Cold War, the newly independent Indonesia loudly refused to take side. The position was taken amidst a heated public discourse among the elites of the Indonesian parliamentary democracy. To counter fierce attacks from Indonesia Communist Party that supported the re-rapprochement with the Soviet Union, Indonesia's Vice President/Prime Minister Mohammad Hatta delivered a powerful speech at the Central National Commission meeting on September 2, 1948, articulating an "independent and active principle of foreign policy". This statement was reinforced by a verbal response at the hearing session on September 16, 1948. The unambiguous message was the country would seek to find a different way in engaging the world, neither neutralized nor aligned with one of the evolving power blocks. The principle and its metaphor "rowing between two reefs", did not put Indonesia in isolation from world affairs. In fact, Indonesia would actively seek to put forth the notion's interest to craft a better international system but would do so free alliances. In short, the country does not want to be "aligned" with any of the super powers, however, it prefers to have a beneficial partnership with all of them. An independent and active foreign policy reflects a belief that Indonesia has the right to be the "subject" of its history rather than just an "object" in someone else's.

"The policy of the republic must be resolved in the light of its own interest and should be executed in consonance with the fact it has to face".

Other contributing factor to the characteristic of Indonesia's foreign policy is the national ideology, Pancasila that reflects the country's deeply rooted tolerance and pluralistic outlook of fundamental differences (Anwar, 2003). This strong sense of moderation provides a direction for the country to confront various fundamental differences in foreign policy such as ideology, religion and school of thought. These key principles were formally stipulated in the act no 37/1999 on foreign relation that become the first act on foreign relations.

The independent and active foreign policy has served well the interest of the newly independent nation and contributed to the making of an exceptional Indonesian diplomatic heritage in the following decades. The country proudly hosted the historical Asia Africa Conference in 1955 that spread the wind of change in the Asia and Africa continents for pursuing their independence. During the Cold War, Indonesia successfully formalized the independent and active foreign policy in the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Indonesia together with several like-minded states such as India and Yugoslavia co-founded the movement in 1961. Since, the inception of NAM, Indonesia has consistently maintained moderate positions. As NAM Chairman in 1992-1995, Indonesia, as one of the Asian "Tigers", led NAM position away from the rhetoric of North South confrontation and instead, advocated the broadening of North South cooperation in the area of development. A fact that Indonesia was part of "Asia Miracle" had been turned into a mean of leadership to change the mentality and ethos of developing countries.

As a country with the world's largest Muslim population, Indonesia is a respectable member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC). From time to time, it carefully considers the interest of Islamic solidarity in its foreign policy decisions while providing a moderating influence in the OIC.

As shown in the country's policy in the OIM and NAM, moderation is in the DNA of Indonesia's national character. In Indonesia, the extremists are faced with an extraordinarily resilient foe in Indonesia's famously syncretic, diverse and tolerant culture (Lohman, 2007).

Regionally, the country also played an undeniable leading role as one of the founding members of ASEAN. In the late 1970's, Indonesia played an active role in the peace settlement in Cambodia and Southern Philippines.

Apart from the fact that from one regime to another, Indonesia has constantly maintained an active posture on its external relation. Like any other country, however, Indonesia has to give up its activism in the conduct of foreign policy when the country faces an intense internal crisis. Those periods, among other included few years following the sudden transfer of power from president sukarno to president suharto and when the country faced multi dimension crisis in the aftermath of the Asia financial crisis in 1998. During those periods, Indonesia tended to be more inward-looking and had narrow ambitions in foreign policy. The foreign policy objectives were concentrated on solving profound domestic problems such as helping the economic recovery and consolidating domestic politics.

Indonesia's foreign policy underwent some remarkable changes after Suharto when the country embarked the Reformasi. A leader-centric approach focusing on exploring key leaders' role in making foreign policies that could well analyze the Indonesia foreign policy in both Sukarno and Suharto eras was no longer sufficient in explaining the foreign policy making during the initial phase of democratization in Indonesia. Other factors such as international pressure and political legitimacy of the new democratic government, however, became an essential variable to review Indonesia's foreign policy during those periods.

After seven tumultuous years of democratization, Indonesia had the first-directly-elected president SBY who introduced his own metaphor "navigating a turbulent ocean" to describe the current challenges of Indonesia foreign policy (Susilo, 2005b). He further added that the foreign policy was founded on four principles: maintaining a constructive approach to diplomacy, maintaining the country's identity in the world, maintaining a nationalist attitude and avoiding military alliances with other countries.

Foreign policy is seemingly pushed toward more national position during president Joko Widodo era. The president is almost exclusively focused on a narrow set of pragmatic economic programs specifically, infrastructure, deregulation and de-bureaucratisation (Warburton, 2016). In the inaugural address, the president outlined the vision of Indonesia's sovereignty in political, economic and cultural arenas commonly known as Trisakti. It has nine programs called Nawacita that includes Returning the state to its task of protecting all citizens and providing a safe environment developing clean, effective, trusted and democratic governance development of peripheral areas Reforming law enforcement agencies improving quality of life increasing productivity and competitiveness Promoting economic independence by developing domestic strategic sectors overhauling the character of the nation and strengthening the spirit of "unity in diversity" and social reform. Nawacita very much colors Indonesian foreign policy with the spirit of "down to earth" diplomacy. The first Nawacita, for example, dictates foreign policy to emphasize more on the protection of Indonesian nationals abroad through three approaches: prevention, early detection and protection.

Presiden Widodo has also the vision known as the "maritime axis" with five main pillars: developing a maritime culture in Indonesia, protecting and managing the country's maritime resources, building and developing maritime infrastructure and connectivity, developing maritime cooperation through diplomacy and building up maritime defense and security.

The president's statements and policy responses represent a growing awareness that in midst of continuing and rapid changes in the strategic environment, the country is now in a particular era of history where foreign policy needs to be adjusted in a way that meets the expectation of the current reality.

New challenges and opportunities foreign policy during president Yudhoyono and president joko Widodo administrations: The Indonesia's independent and active foreign policy was facing a new milieu in the 21st century both in domestic and global settings. Internally, the country has the first-popularly-elected president who viewed the international affairs as an important variable of his policy.

Since, the day he took oath as the sixth president of Indonesia, president SBY had a strong international character. The condition he faced had further strengthened his belief that the country's external engagement becomes one of the key factors for the success of his administration to attain national interest. Less than three months in the office, president had to face an extreme problem in handling the fatal devastation of Tsunami tragedy. The external relations became imminent factor in handling the situation because the scale of calamity had made the rehabilitation and reconstruction of tsunami could not be handled only by

exerting domestic resources. In a frank confession on the role of foreign policy and his expectation for Indonesian diplomats, the president said.

"Foreign policy has a critical role in my administration and I hope all the Indonesian diplomats who are in this room that I have high hopes for them and that I am counting on your creativity and contributions" (Susilo, 2005c).

Accordingly, the president constantly pursued higher international profile for Indonesia. He always gives meaningful substance on his foreign trips such initiate a frank discussion on democratic reform in Myanmar (March, 2006) and a major speech on the need for the Muslim world to embrace globalization and technology for greater social and economic progress during his visit to several middle Eastern countries April and May, 2006. At bilateral level, Indonesia established agreement of strategic partnership with almost all major powers around the world such as China and India in 200.

Indonesia's new activism becomes even more pervasive in multilateral and regional fronts. The president kept close contact and correspondence with the UN secretary general to raise various global issues that was of his outmost concern such as food and energy crisis. Indonesia strenuously maintained a high-profile position within UN, WTO and G20. Indonesia held a non permanent seat on the UN Security Council (2007-2008). The country was also very active in organizing various international events such as the Fifty Year Celebration of Asia Africa Conference (2005), D8 Summit (2006), the 13th conference of party of the UN Framework of Climate change/COP UNFCC (2007) and International Anti Corruption Conference (2008). In November 2006, Indonesia participated in UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) by sending about 1.000 peacekeeping troops to southern Lebanon and replaced those troops with second contingent a year later. At regional level, Indonesia is among the key actors to formulate the progressive vision of an ASEAN community.

In light of his belief in the crucial role of the country's external relations, the president underlined the urgent need for the country to have the new approach in its foreign policy. He called it new energy in the country's foreign policy. This new energy in foreign policy had ignited not only the Ministry of Foreign Affairs but also his bureaucracy machineries to conduct more active external relations. Economic bureaucracy machineries for example had successfully conducting the first Indonesia-led CGI meeting on January 19, 2005 in which the Indonesian government not only set the agenda of the meeting but also formulated its own borrowing strategy to ensure that the decision on loan program and projects match the economic and social needs of Indonesia.

Responding to the new situation in which Indonesia, as new member of middle income countries is no longer eligible for concessional/soft loan, BAPPENAS has successfully introduced and concluded an agreement with 22 Indonesia's major creditors that is called Jakarta commitment on aid effectiveness. Although, it was not legally binding but the agreement stipulated that Indonesia got more power to access project financing without burdensome conditions. The commitment that was signed in January 2009 empowered Indonesia to lead all foreign funded projects (Jakarta Post, 01/19/2009). Meanwhile, under the leadership of a progressive Minister of Finance, Dr. Sri Mulyani Indrawati, Ministry of Finance also taken rigorous action on its external engagement by among other, initiating and successfully conducting the first ever finance minister meeting on climate change at the side line of the 13th COP UNFOC in Bali. Ministry of Finance also takes an active role in G20 deliberation by among other proposing the global expenditure support fund and together with france, co-chairing the forth working group on the world bank and other Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). The working group will consider crucial issues such as mandates, governance, resourcing and policy instruments of the MDBs in light of the needs of their members and the pressures resulting from the impact of the downturn on developing countries.

Indonesia new activism was also supported by the fact that as the country successfully embarked democratization. Various sensitive issues such as issues relating to human right, democratization, anti-corruption and good governance becomes less sensitive. Indonesia joins the club of countries that proudly adhere to the principles of democracy, transparency and accountability. Indonesia is also keen to advance these basic principles in its external interaction with other countries both in regional and global level. In December 2008, Indonesia organized the Bali Democracy Forum, the first inter governmental forum on democracy in Asia.

In addition to strong drive of the president to conduct a new activism, foreign policy was also influenced by the dynamic of vigorous reform process that the country embraced since the downfall of president Suharto in 1998. The foreign policy was compelled to be more responsive to the domestic struggle. In this context, the "domestic structure" a decentralized, diffused and divided political structure closely connected to policy decisions in foreign policy (Zakaria, 1999). In democratic system, the role of domestic stakeholders became imminent in the foreign policy decision. One particular example would be the country's position toward the issue of nuclear in Iran that has been metamorphosed from supporting sanction on Iran (SC Res. 1737/2007) to an

abstain position (SC Res. 1803/2008) and supporting a dialog and negotiation in solving the issue after the government faced a mounting domestic pressure.

In addition to this internal transformation, Indonesia foreign policy faced new external setting that was mainly characterized by the absent of a pervasive ideological battle. This multi polar world also witnessed the emergence of China as a new power house in particular the economic sphere. It is also characterized by increasingly essential role of non-state actors in foreign policy as well as the rise of emerging economies that enjoy an increasing role in the world economy.

This global trend along with the Indonesia's successful path of democratization and economic reform as well as Indonesia's active engagement in the discussion of global issues generated "recognitions" by external stakeholders that elevate Indonesia's standing in global arena. Indonesia, for the first time, was invited to attend the outreach session of the G-8 Summit in Toyako Hokaido, Japan in 2008. Through its council resolution on enlargement and enhanced engagement in May 2007, the OECD placed Indonesia in the "enhanced engagement five" (EE5) countries together with Brazil, China, India and South Africa was given opportunities to strengthen their cooperation with OECD with a view to possible membership.

In addition to "recognition" by established institutions, Indonesia was also invited to join various country-led global endeavors. Although, the country's record in Maternal Mortality Rate (MMR) was among the worst in region, president Yudhoyono was requested by prime minister of Norway Jens Stoltenberg to join and launch a health related initiative called the network of Global Leaders for MDGs 4 and 5 (NGL) at the side line of UNGA in September, 2007. Indonesia, the only Asian country involved in this initiative, was latter successful in holding the Second Meeting of the Sherpa of NGL in Jakarta, June 2008 that was attended by Sherpa/ Representatives of head of stated/governments from brazil, chile, the netherland, norway, tanzania and United Kingdom as well as representatives from international organizations. In relation to Indonesia participation in the G-20 initiatives there was also an expectation that while Indonesia was not the most important emerging market member of G20, it, however, played a key role in consensus building because of its non-aligned status and its stellar performance as a new democracy (Reiffiel, 2008).

High expectations are also stemmed from the very nature of Indonesia such as its huge Muslim population and its policy performance. The administration of president SBY's had been regarded as a government that would have an unprecedented opportunity to set Indonesia on the road to good governance and economic prosperity (Rieffel, 2004, 2008). As the world largest Islamic nation, Indonesia is also considered as having a duty to contribute to the progressive development of global Muslim society. In addition, as a developing country with a long history of finding solution to gargantuan economic challenges, Indonesia is also expected to contribute to the daunting challenge of poverty eradication.

President Widodo came to office during a lot different both internal and external settings. President Widodo who was formerly Jakarta Governor and city of Surakarta Mayor had limited exposure and experience in foreign relations. With no root in military and political party systems, president Widodo represents a new model of political advancement in Indonesia (Connelly, 2017).

It was perceived that the president did not have definite strong views about Indonesia's position in the world. He regards himself primarily as a domestic reformer not an international statesman. Nevertheless, his policy statement does include a list of foreign policy priorities such as promoting Indonesia's identity as an archipelagic state, enhancing the global role of middle power diplomacy, expanding engagement in the Indo-Pacific region and further reform of the foreign ministry to emphasis economic diplomacy. Those foreign policy priorities undeniably lean toward a more nationalist drive (Connelly, 2017).

National agenda indeed demands the president's full attention. On one side, there is a lack of infrastructure development and an alarming high GINI ratio. On the other side, there is a challenging domestic political environment due to strong opposition from an opposition coalition in the legislature body and vigorous and open disagreements among ministers and government agencies.

Inward looking trend reflects his recognition that these pressing issues that affect the immediate wellbeing of Indonesians must be urgently addressed.

In the external setting, president Widodo has to face a much unpredictable and harsh reality. In regional context, the world witness Chinese behavior in the South China Sea has become increasingly assertive. In global context, the result of Brexit vote and US presidential election have caught the world by surprise. More inward looking and narrow nationalist messages have been aired more frequently and openly in the world stage.

Responding the new challenges; in search of intelligent responses: Both internal and external environment have opened up a new possibility for Indonesia to play a major role in the international arena and the biggest challenge is

whether or not the country can keep up with the expectation. A research conducted by Paige Johnson Tan, however, found that Indonesia perceptions of the country's world role and the realities of its capacities are in tension. Troublesome domestic, natural disaster, separatist turmoil and in particular, the economic insecurity have forced the country's foreign policy to narrowly focus on securing the country's territorial unity and most basic economic needs.

To bridge the gap between expectation and capabilities, a country might choose to lower the expectation. However, it would be difficult if not possible, to lower the expectation since the leaders are having higher targets and grater ambitions. President SBY clearly stated that "Indonesia is now an outward-looking country that eager to shape regional and international order and intend on having our voice heard" (Susilo, 2015).

Lowering aspiration is also deemed insensible for various reasons. Firstly, aspiration for global role is in fact, our constitutional mandate as clearly stipulated in the preamble of the constitutions. Secondly, activism in foreign policy indeed also represents the virtue of our foreign policy. Regardless whoever regime that is in power, Indonesia has always maintained an active foreign policy. Thirdly and most importantly, in the absence of political and economic power, the aspiration would be a rare and precious asset in our foreign policy. Accordingly, we need to nurture and strengthen the aspiration of new activism in the foreign affairs to advance our national interest.

Facing this situation, Indonesia should make its strenuous efforts to increase its capabilities to a certain level that enable the country to response the aspiration not only properly but also intelligently. Our ability to manage our response also matters to our very existence. For instance because of asymmetrical relationship in its engagement with its strategic partners, Indonesia might face a problem of making its partnerships serve its interest without becoming simply a function of the interest of partners. Indonesia's new activism in its foreign policy should be managed in such a way so that it will not hit all the reefs (Bandoro, 2006).

Our efforts to response intelligently would be largely depends on our ability to overcome challenges and capitalize assets and opportunities we have.

There are at least two challenges that might hinder the effort. The first challenge would derive from our diplomatic inheritance. From Chapters 2, it can be summarized that apart from some insignificant drawbacks, a journey of Indonesia foreign policy has been well decorated with marvelous achievement. Although, this will naturally enrich our nationalist aspiration, this splendid diplomatic heritage would easily mislead our foreign policy posture and priorities to a merely "style" and "less substantive". Our "nostalgic" response would unlikely result an "unadulterated" policy action which reflected what Indonesia is today. Some critics claimed that constructing a golden vision of foreign policy without considering real social context has led to a failure to develop diplomacy that is truly beneficial for our people. In other words, the question to ask is whether the Indonesia's foreign policy initiatives have supported domestic needs when they aimed at building "prestige" than touching on the real domestic concern of the country. In fact, the ultimate goal of our diplomacy is to promote our national interest "every step in our foreign policy is undertaken by advancing and we dedicated it to the national interest".

From the above paragraph, we learn that crucial challenge would be how we can identify national interest that would be nationally accepted and supported by all domestic stakeholders of the foreign policy. This would be the second challenge that would be crucial in ensuring that there is a true linkage between our international exposure and our effort to solve our economic, social and domestic security problems.

To be able to sharpen the focus of our national interest, we should identify the most urgent need among many domestic needs that prevail. This study argues that social economic interest would be priority number one. The presidents have repeatedly stated that bringing greater prosperity for Indonesia is the priority (Susilo, 2015).

Although, social economy is the priority, this does not mean that security needs are not vital they are just less pressing in the current situation for various reasons.

Firstly, although there are still some imperfections of our achievement in political stability and security sphere, the country for quite some time has enjoyed political stability and national territorial integrity. Regional unrest and separation movements have been successfully handled. Se condly, Indonesian people who have gone through a strenuous reform, decentralization and democratization process urgently need a peace or democracy dividend in term of increasing their welfare in facing a difficult economic situation.

Thirdly, there is a critical need to guard our democracy. Economic progress is itself a decisive factor in the survival of democracy, however, democracy is not the decisive factor in economic performance. The probability of democratic failure is very high at low incomes and diminishes progressively as incomes become

higher. Various studies indicate that at incomes per capita of over 6,600 dollar the survival of democratic system is much higher and the probability of its failure is only 1/500. That level is regarded as the safety zone for democracy to exist and sustain. With GDP per capita PPP in Indonesia averaged 6935.69 USD from 1990 until 2015, Indonesia are barely in the safety zone. The best strategy for the country would be to quickly leave this dangerous zone and avoid slower economic growth and higher population growth. With the impact of prolonged global economic crisis, lower economic growth would be very much predicted. It indeed takes a longer time to guard and consolidate Indonesia's democracy.

In addition to tackling those two challenges our ability to response intelligently will depend on our ability to capitalize assets in our foreign policy. The first assets would be our distinct basic values that give soul to our foreign policy. The true brand of our foreign policy would include moderation and tolerant as hallmark traits of the nation because the need for tolerance is a core survival skill learned as a result of Indonesia's own heterogeneity. Our foreign policy is also active and pragmatic because Indonesians do not want to be "aligned" with any of the great powers and prefer to have a beneficial partnership with all of them. In addition, it is strong and salient style of diplomacy that is accepted widely because it makes our counterparts comfortable in negotiation. Rudolpho C. Soverino stated that the strong element of Indonesia's diplomacy lay on its self-control not in dominating or throwing its weight around needlessly (Priatne, 2005).

Our foreign policy is also enriched by "factual" assets such as Indonesia's size and strategic location as well as the country's richness in history, resources and culture. Recent development of global politics further highlights the importance of two other assets that the country possess, first Indonesia as the third largest democracy and second Indonesia as the most populous Muslim country. These two asses have significantly made Indonesia's position critical in the global dialogue.

The last asset in the foreign policy is the application of systems thinking in our foreign policy, both externally and internally.

System thinking is a discipline for seeing the "structures" that underlie complex situations and for discerning high from low leverage change. It highlights that our common practice to break apart problem and fragment the world to make complex tasks be more manageable have made us lost our intrinsic connection to a larger whole. We merely focus on snapshots of isolated parts of the system and wonder why our deepest problems never seem to get solved. The idea is that everything is interrelated and that decision can not be made in isolation without it having an impact on a variety of other matters beyond our horizon.

There are indications that both presidents are leaders who employ a system thinking approach. By holding to this principles, both presidents acknowledge that if we want to achieve our foreign policy goals, we must understand how our decisions have an impact on events, including unintended consequence, over the horizon. It is impossible to react as if each isolated events exists in a vacuum.

President SBY applies systems thinking paradigm in assessing the world affairs. His foreign policy is directed to diversity its relationships and he considers that small and big countries are equally important. In his refusal to take a partial approach, he is pioneering the "all-direction foreign policy" with a spirit of "zero enemy and a million friends of Indonesia". He fairly refuses to entertain the confusion of short-term events and stays focus in the ultimate goal and the big picture of event.

It was recorded that during the G-20 Summit in London, the president refused to bow to pressure over-focusing on details (stimulus vs. reform) that concealed a larger picture. He came up with a compromise and constructive solution that made the Summit a success. His statement: "Man does not live by bread alone. He must also have his freedom and his ethics" emphasizes that there is interconnection between a numbers of issue. They are not separate challenges they are indeed part of one big problem that cannot be broken down into small parts if we want to solve it. Taking it apart may look easier but it in reality, doing so only makes solving the larger problem even more difficult.

On his own take, Presiden Widodo has also a built in system thinking approach in his foreign policy undertaking. Activism in foreign policy during president Widodo's tenure indeed takes a different form. Jokowi has not lost interest in foreign policy but simply possesses a different understanding of what constitutes "constructive" foreign policy in SBY's term. For example, his Global Maritime Fulcrum policy that is recognized as his signature foreign policy, provides an excellent approach of system thinking. The policy is strategically designed to address the massive infrastructure development required to unlock Indonesia's domestic economic integration and drive growth. As such he perceives the strengthening of bilateral, rather that multilateral, relationships as the most efficient policy for attracting foreign investment to meet the US$6 billion required to develop Indonesia's port infrastructure (Shopie, 2015).

Jokowi's consentration on bilateral relationships reflects his administration's prioritizing of result-driven foreign policy. He is inclined to only pursue foreign policy that has the capacity to directly benefit the domestic agenda and the Indonesian people hence the "pro-people diplomacy". This is the genuine form of assertiveness that is essential if foreign policy are to respond intelligently to the new challenges and opportunities.

Systems thinking, however, have to be applied not only in the external environment but also in the internal environment of foreign policy. It is simply because our performance in international diplomacy greatly depends on our domestic situation. In reality, an ambition to obtain a front-liner image without having a strong domestic structural base would do more harm than good.

The burden of intelligent response should not all be placed on the execution of foreign policy but should also be represented by consistency in policy direction and implementation within the administration. The ultimate goal in foreign policy could only be achieved it if we were doing well at home such as creating transparency and good governance, so we could have strength, capacity ad credibility to do more in world affairs (Jakarta Post, 8/20/2005). In this context, the "intermestic role" of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) will give MFA an additional strategic role to play that will enable the MFA to be the spearhead to promote national interest as well as to communicate the world development into domestic audience.

The impact of the democratization that grooms domestic non-state actors in the Indonesia foreign policy as well as the "new energy" in foreign policy that has been contagious to the bureaucracy machinery of the government have provided ample essential resources for our intelligent response. These responses are characterized, among other by our ability to formulate smart policy and maintain solid position in many aspects of Indonesia foreign policy.

In this context, The MFA has also to transform itself into a learning organization and avoiding the vicious cycle of learning disability. MFA has taken initial steps on this such as conducting internal reform/benah diri. These efforts has indeed resulted various achievements such as ISO 9001 2008 for recruitment process.

To further transform itself into a learning organization, a shift of mind is required to enable MFA to outreach beyond the traditional task of diplomacy and play a strategic role to bridge between international and domestic factors. Accordingly, Law Number 37/1999 and Law Number 24/2000 could serve as the legal basis for MFA to lead relevant stakeholders in synergistic approach and analysis in the foreign policy. This is the real implementation of "total diplomacy" approach that involves all components of the nations in synergy and views the problems integrally.

CONCLUSION

Activism in foreign policy has been the spirit of Indonesia independent and active foreign policy. Despite any political system that is in place or any regime that is in power, the country has maintained an activism in foreign policy. Various tribulations that the country faces, such as abrupt regime change in 1965 and the political and social upheaval in the aftermath of Asia financial crisis in 1998 have never changed the country character of pursuing activism in foreign affairs. Indonesia has been through the difficult times and always re-emerges stronger.

The country's aspiration for a world role is further enhanced by the new internal and external challenges that include the country's excursion to uncharted Reformasi process as well as the shifting of global power configuration. There are ample refreshed aspiration and expectation by both internal and external stakeholders for Indonesia to play a world role.

The biggest challenge is whether or not the country can keep up with the expectation on the midst of obvious gap between the aspiration of country's world role and the realities of its capacities. To ease the tension between expectation and capabilities, the country can only make its strenuous efforts to increase its capabilities to a certain level that enable the country to response to the aspiration not only properly but also intelligently. Foreign policy is not merely how to best articulate leaders' slogan of "one million friends and zero enemies" or "down to earth diplomacy" but also how to accurately anticipate future events and developments to devise the most appropriate policies response.

Our efforts to response intelligently would be largely depends on our ability to overcome challenges and capitalize assets and opportunities. The most crucial challenge is to be able to sharpen the focus of our national interest. There are two main reasons for arguing that our current priority should be the social economic interest of the country, firstly to ensure that the nation's external affairs remains relevant to the aspiration of the people and secondly to guard and consolidate democracy in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the most important asset is the application of systems thinking in our foreign policy. It is the leverage in the causal loop diagram.

Application of systems thinking in both external and internal environment of foreign policy is deemed

critical. Externally, it will assist us to minimize our tendencies to focus on snapshots of isolated parts of the system and begin to picture the deepest problems by weaving different challenges into an "invisible fabric of interrelated actions".

Internally, the application of systems thinking will assist the country to response intelligently by formulating smart policy and maintaining solid position in our foreign policy. This process would require the strategic role of MFA as an "intermestic factor" to conduct a mind shifting. The MFA should to move beyond traditional task of diplomacy and has to abolish perception that MFA is solely a political Ministry, simply because it is under the coordination of coordinating ministry of political, law and economic problems. This shift of mind deems essential for MFA to be able to adopt the system thinking, establish learning organization in MFA and overcome the learning disabilities.

After successfully conducting this mind shifting, MFA can then play a role to manage a synergic approach and analysis to formulate and conduct a solid position and policy in Indonesia's external engagements. In this context, Law Number 37/1999 and Law Number 24/2000 could provide a legal basis for MFA to coordinate relevant stakeholders to come up with Indonesia's intelligent response in the conduct of foreign affairs. To be able to conduct this role satisfactorily, MFA should expand the horizon beyond conventional issues in the "comfort zone" and master a core technical substance that come across in the discussion/negotiation. The whole process should be based on a strong bond of continuous dialog and close rapport with relevant domestic stakeholders of foreign policy.

MFA is facing a crucial challenge of linking the application of systems thinking both in external and internal environment of foreign policy. Only by meeting this challenge can we fulfill the nation's dream that Indonesia can cope with the expectation and come up with intelligent response in foreign policy. As an anonymous person once said "if a person has a dream. It is just a dream but if a nation has dream, it is a dawn of reality".

REFERENCES

Anwar, D.F., 2003. Key aspect of Indonesia's foreign policy. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.

Bandoro, B., 2006. Indonesia's foreign policy is all about image. Jakarta Post, Central Jakarta, Indonesia.

Connelly, A.L., 2017. Indonesian foreign policy under president jokowi. Lowy Institute, Sydney, Australia.https://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/Indonesia-foreign-policy-under-president-jokowi.

Lohman, W., 2007. Adjusting to the reality of a democratic Indonesia. Freedom House, Washington, USA.

Priatne, P.L.E., 2005. Revisiting Indonesia's foreign policy. The Jakarta Post, Central Jakarta, Indonesia.

Retno, M.L.P., 2009. Indonesia, the US: A new partnership. The Jakarta Post, Central Jakarta, Indonesia.

Rieffel, L., 2004. Indonesia's quite revolution. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Rieffel, L., 2008. Indonesia's Democracy Lessons. The Yale Globalist Publishing, Jakarta, Indonesia..

Shopie, Q., 2015. A retreat from multilateralism: Foreign policy restructuring under Jokowi. Australian Institute of International Affairs, Canberra, Australia.

Susilo, Y.B., 2005a. Accelerating the wheels of the Indonesian economy. Consultative Group on Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Susilo, Y.B., 2005b. Indonesia and America on a changing world. US Indonesia Society, Washington, USA.

Susilo, Y.B., 2005c. Things to remember as you grow up. Remarks to Visiting Jakarta International High School Students, Istana Negara, Jakarta.

Susilo, Y.B., 2009. Indonesia: Regional role, global reach, speech by president of the Republic of Indonesia. London School of Economics and Political Science, London, England.

Susilo, Y.B., 2015. An independent and active foreign policy for the 21st century. Indonesian Council on World Affairs, Jakarta, Indonesia.

Warburton, E., 2016. Jokowi and the new developmentalism. Bull. Indonesian Econ. Stud., 52: 297-320.

Zakaria, F., 1999. From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, USA., ISBN:978-0-691-04496-1, Pages: 201.