

## Research Articles

### Indonesia Parliamentary Diplomacy: The Leadership of House Representatives Republic of Indonesia in ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA) 2011-2012

M. Jullyo Bagus Firdaus<sup>1</sup>  
 Department of International Relations  
 UPN "Veteran" Jawa Timur  
[jullyo.firdaus@gmail.com](mailto:jullyo.firdaus@gmail.com)

Megahnanda Alidyan Kresnawati<sup>2</sup>  
 Department of International Relations  
 UPN "Veteran" Jawa Timur  
[megahnanda.hi@upnjatim.ac.id](mailto:megahnanda.hi@upnjatim.ac.id)

#### Abstract

*This paper discusses the implementation of Indonesian parliamentary diplomacy when Indonesia became the leader of the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA) (2011-2012). In the same period, Indonesia also assumed the chairmanship of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Developed from the concept of multi-track diplomacy and total diplomacy, the authors highlight how the House of Representatives of Republic Indonesia (DPR-RI) plays a role in a track 1½ diplomacy. The authors argue that DPR-RI's active participation is essential to oversee national compliance on international legal norms and rules through the case of AIPA.*

**Keywords:** Parliamentary Diplomacy, The House of Representatives Republic Indonesia, ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly, Total Diplomacy, Multi-track Diplomacy.

#### I. Introduction

Discussing the epistemology of foreign policy analysis in International Relations, two major schools of thought influence a country's

foreign policy. First, *Real Politik* refers to the tradition of the realist paradigm on the structure, material of a nation, and the international system is essential for foreign policy. In comparison, others believe that domestic conditions are necessary. According to Robert Putnam in *Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games*, he argued that international politics had implications for domestic politics and implies domestic actors respond to international politics (Putnam, 1988).

Hudson (2014) explains that there are potential actors in domestic politics who have influenced foreign policy. The potential actors include the executive branch of government, the legislative branch, the judicial branch, political parties, and business coalitions (Hudson, 2014). In a democratic government, the power is divided into *Trias Politica*, namely executive, legislative, and judicial. The role of diplomacy between countries to achieve world peace only belongs to the executive function. However, scholars need to pay more attention to the parliament due to their legislative role. This paper highlights how the parliament's role is crucial in international relations.

Initially, scholars started to study the practice of diplomacy carried out by the parliamentary branch through the case of Inter-parliamentary Union (IPU). IPU was established in 1889, where no governments, parliaments, or parliamentarians cooperated at the international level. Yet, there is still a lack of discussion on parliamentary diplomacy within the international relations study. (Inter-Parliamentary Union, n.d).

William Randal Cremer founded the organization, and France's Frédéric Passy laid the foundations for all the countries that followed. They formed an association of

<sup>1</sup> The author received his bachelor's degree in social sciences from the UPN "Veteran" Jawa Timur

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer of the Department of International Relations, UPN "Veteran" Jawa Timur

parliamentarians, transformed into a global organization that thrived today.

Nowadays, this organization has 179 members of Parliament from member countries and 12 associations of parliamentary organizations. The House of Representatives of Republic Indonesia (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia, DPR RI) officially become a member of IPU in 1959. Indonesia began to send delegates regularly to IPU conferences from 1976 (BKSAP, n.d.).

The discussion on parliamentary diplomacy was conveyed by Lesley Master entitled *South Africa's Emerging Parliamentary Diplomacy and Soft Power*. According to Lesley Master (2015), the parliamentary diplomacy procedures require a process in which discussions with the community of countries strategically focus on international relations and foreign policy. Lesley Master revealed that in international relations, parliaments are involved at two levels: institutional diplomacy and diplomatic or lobbying approach. Firstly, the parliaments have some of their roles delegated to cooperate with other nations' Parliament. Respectively, the parliaments have designated the right and role to approve international treaties, organize a strategic meeting with targeted foreign specialists, especially for cooperation and creation of joint committees on specific agenda. The practicality of parliamentary diplomacy, especially in the regional sector, can be observed in European Union (EU). In this regionalism, European Parliament (EP) has formal powers to approve the Union's international agreements and legislation, with an external impact, to a simply consultative role on sure aspects of common foreign and security policy (CFSP). According to K. Raube, J. Wouters, and M. Müftüler-Baç (2019), bilateral and multilateral parliamentary diplomacy between the European Parliament and third countries and regions "would not be regarded as competing with, but rather complementing,

the larger range of EU diplomatic operations." Moreover, in her journal, Onderco (2017) argued that when Members of Parliaments (MP) attend international conferences, they cannot exercise any oversight over foreign policy. However, they have an essential role in international conferences. Parliament's position in the country's constitutional system matters to understanding how the Parliament becomes involved in the country's foreign policy.

The House of Representatives of Republic Indonesia (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia - DPR RI) delegation participated continuously and actively in the activities and agendas of the IPU. Both regular assembly meetings are held 2 (two) times each year, and other sessions are sponsored by the IPU in collaboration with agencies under the United Nations. Thus, Indonesia is increasingly recognized by members of the national parliamentary delegations of other countries. From 2011-2012, Indonesia became the ASEAN Inter-parliamentary Assembly (AIPA) leader. Indonesia has contributed to the de-escalation of the South China Sea conflict. Parliamentary Forums at the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) level need to be considered. The urgency of ASEAN's position for Indonesia occupies the first concentric circle in Indonesia's foreign policy framework. The methodology of this paper is based on the qualitative descriptive analysis combined with literature studies to analyze data. The qualitative descriptive method in International Relations is a method that conducts a study of one or more foreign policies, with the decision-making process to be traced at the micro-historical level (Bennett, 2005). In addition, this method is used to explain the phenomenon equipped with data and describe the phenomenon that occurs. These phenomena can be described from various sources, including literature studies. This paper describes how the diplomatic position of the

Indonesian Parliament, vis-à-vis with the executive in the Southeast Asia region at the AIPA forum for the period 2011-2012.

## II. Theoretical Framework

### *a. Parliamentary Diplomacy Concept*

The Parliamentary Diplomacy concept is still hard to define due to a lack of literature in both diplomacy studies and international relations study. The implementation of parliamentary diplomacy in International Relations seems to fade because the duties of Parliament are understood to be a concern with domestic politics. The position of Parliament in implementing diplomacy, could be refer to the opinion of N. Götz, who said that diplomacy is divided into two elaborations, namely methodically and procedurally and as a concept (Götz, 2005). As a method, parliamentary diplomacy is the way or process by which decision-making takes, like in the United Nations (UN), especially in General Assembly processes, using one-country rules or one official vote for representative purposes and to a lesser extent for decision making. While as a concept, N. Götz considered parliamentary diplomacy as diplomacy carried out by parliamentarians as actors, or agents, in International Relations.

In this case, before interacting with actors from other countries, the legislature takes its diplomatic approach, besides the executive branch. According to Daniel Fiott, several actors carry out parliamentary diplomacy, starting from individual parliamentarians, political parties, local parliaments or assemblies, national parliaments, regional parliaments, and international parliaments (Fiott, 2011). There are three main categories of parliamentary diplomacy: members of Parliament, political

parties, and parliaments (local, regional, or international).

In addition, Gorge Noulas said that parliamentary diplomacy is one of the factors that can support the success of a diplomatic effort of a country (Noulas, 2011). Considering that the diplomatic process carried out by Parliament is generally more flexible and open, without rigid bureaucratic barriers, it usually makes it easier to achieve or approach the desired diplomatic goals. The role of Parliament in a country's diplomacy will certainly help implement and clarify the position of a country's foreign policy by affirming the stance in parliamentary forums on the executive's attitude in international politics.

### *b. Total Diplomacy and Its Implementation as Multi-track Diplomacy*

Total diplomacy explains international relations, not only between states (government to government) but also non-state actors. For example, global civil society has an influence that cannot be reached by the state and has legitimacy independent of the state. Hasan Wirajuda, The Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Yudhoyono administration, launched the concept of Total Diplomacy, which aims to involve various sectors of society in Indonesia's diplomacy and foreign policy. More, Hassan Wirajuda emphasized that Bung Hatta's speech had a vision about how diplomacy should be implemented (Wirajuda, 2006). Bung Hatta conveyed that the implementation of diplomacy is a combination of the government's diplomatic capabilities and the support of the people. This combination is very relevant to current developments, especially the globalization process, which gives rise to non-government actors in foreign policy relations. In the context of total diplomacy, not only the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the

perpetrator of diplomacy, but all components of the nation are involved as much as possible in the preparation and determination of Indonesia's foreign policy.

According to Safril Hidayat (2014), total diplomacy is a manifestation of Multi-track Diplomacy, which is in line with the development of global trends where the implementation of diplomacy no longer sees the state as a single actor (unitary actor) in international relations. In the USA, Total diplomacy has also been applied during the reign of Harry S. Truman, when the cold war conditions needed a balanced of polarity with the Soviet Union to fight the expansion of communism in the international arena. Total diplomacy is the same as the implementation of total war; the achievement of national interests requires sacrifices on the part of the people to support their country (Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Thierry Balzacq, 2016).

Furthermore, democratic countries must educate their people about the management of foreign relations that are useful for a country. The implementation of total diplomacy consists of a network of experts who lead public education efforts to teach about how to step in achieving national interests. Quoting from A. Saefudin Ma'mun in his book entitled "*Citra Indonesia di Mata Dunia: Gerakan Kebebasan Informasi dan Diplomasi Publik*," total diplomacy is diplomacy that involves all components of the nation in diplomatic activity and is seen as problem-solving for conflicted states in an integrative way (Ma'mun, 2009).

Atiqah Nur Alami believed that total diplomacy requires the synergy of all domestic stakeholders to formulate an integrative foreign policy from an international-domestic perspective (Alami, 2011). Regarding total diplomacy, the author interprets it utilizes as multi-track diplomacy. The presence of the concept of multi-track diplomacy contributes to Indonesia's foreign policy. Referring to the

opinion of Amira Schiff that conflict resolution and peace-building efforts should go through a multilevel process (Schiff, 2010).

Peace-making, sometimes called preventive efforts in the form of a dialogue between actors in international relations, can be carried out in several ways. The classification of multi-track diplomacy, in this study, focuses on the types of diplomacy track 1 and 2. Firstly, Hugh Miall. Oliver Ramsbotham and Tom Woodhouse argued that official government representatives or executives involved in the implementation of diplomacy, this track is carried out to other state actors who have the sticks and carrots effect to obtain results in diplomacy, by 'bargaining' (Miall, 2015). This diplomacy is carried out like the imposition of economic blockade sanctions on other countries. While the second track diplomacy 2 is identical to the implementation of diplomacy through non-state actors who cannot perform or obtain the sticks and carrots effect.

In short, diplomacy track 1 mainly refers to formal conflict resolution and dialogue methods as a form of implementing diplomacy involving official actors, such as diplomats, ministers, heads of state, and representatives of international organizations. Track 2 diplomacy refers to more informal methods that include informal actors, such as global civil society, NGOs, community leaders, and religious leaders. Thus, track 1 diplomacy has a structured and formal character that operates at a higher political level and is indispensable for reaching political agreements and official state dialogues. Meanwhile, track 2 diplomacy is often considered a complement and supports track 1 diplomacy.

Parliamentary diplomacy refers to Thomas Goumenos, which lies on the 1½ Diplomacy route (Goumenos, 2018). Meanwhile, the explanation of the placement of Parliament as track 1½, according to Jeffrey

Robertson, he said that parliaments have the availability of access, the ability to build trust, flexibility, and the opportunity to explore an issue from various sides (Robertson, 2007). The intended key is having the position of members of Parliament who have the convenience of meeting with decision-makers in the countries they visit. In addition, MPs legislative derive confidence that grows from the fact that the people elect MPs legislatures to represent their interests in Parliament. This can be the primary capital to carry diplomatic missions closely related to the welfare and progress of the people in a country.

### **III. Parliamentary Diplomacy Conducted by the House of Representative of Indonesia**

In parliamentary diplomacy, the DPR RI uses the free-active doctrine as a postulate of Indonesia's foreign policy. Moreover, DPR RI and the executive body implement this foreign policy ideology. As the People's Representatives Institution, the DPR RI has several duties in the fields of Legislation, Oversight, and Budget. They also have a role in supporting international diplomacy carried out by the government in the context of Indonesia's national interest, as well as to improve relations and cooperation with countries in the world based on the principle of Free and Active Foreign Policy devoted to the national interest (DPR RI, 2011). Through Parliamentary Diplomacy, the Indonesian House of Representatives fights for the international order of life, based on peace, democracy, human rights, and mutually beneficial cooperation.

The representatives of the Indonesian Parliament in implementing parliamentary diplomacy are very active in multilateral and bilateral cooperation. It can be seen that the number of members of the DPR RI in regional

and global multilateral forums, such as the Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments (ASGP) in 1976, ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA) in 1977 by Presidential Decree no. 3 of 1992 concerning Ratification of the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary and Organization of The Parliamentary Union of Islamic Countries (PUIC) in 1999 (Kementrian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia, n.d.). In the regional sphere, according to Atiqah Nur Alami the active participation of the Indonesian Parliament was seen in the AIPA forum, which was held in Cambodia in September 2011, there has been a shared awareness of the need for Parliament's role to realizing the 2015 ASEAN Community (Alami, 2011, p. 172). Members of Parliament are representatives of the people's voice, so the involvement of Parliament is expected to encourage the vision of developing the ASEAN community. Parliamentarians are asked to be more active in increasing public awareness of their constituents in ASEAN cooperation. They can then follow the social aspirations into all levels of society in the Southeast Asian Region.

### **IV. Indonesia Membership in AIPA**

In 1967, Indonesia was listed as one of the founding fathers of ASEAN. Since then, Indonesia has continued to play an essential role in formulating ASEAN's vision and mission, including in the implementation of the 2015 ASEAN Community. ASEAN is also a cornerstone of Indonesia's foreign policy by placing it in the first concentric circle. The future of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is very dependent on Indonesia's contribution because Indonesia is the one who has sacrificed the most to maintain the continuity of ASEAN (Wicaksana, 2019). Indonesia's role and position in AIPA will

be increasingly important and will greatly be determined by dynamics that continue to develop within ASEAN in 2011-2012. In addition, as the chairman of AIPA, the Indonesian government (executive) also became the Chair of ASEAN in 2011. Indonesia prioritizes three things. First, advancing regional efforts the project of the ASEAN Community. Second, maintaining the order and situation in the area conducive to efforts to achieve development goals. Third, discuss the 2015 ASEAN vision based on the ASEAN Community's role in the world community.

From the three priorities, Indonesia needs to encourage ASEAN to develop as a people-centered organization (Ratna Shofi Inayati, 2011). The initiative brings out by the DPR RI aims to establish the existence of an Open Parliament to complement and strengthen the vision of the formation of a modern parliament. The years 2011 to 2012 are important years to be discussed in this research because the DPR RI became the President of AIPA. This is one of the strategic momentums for the Indonesian House of Representatives to encourage the realization of the 2015 ASEAN Community, which is awaited by member countries in the region, and to create peaceful regional conditions, it could be to increase the cohesiveness of regional multilateralism. The diplomatic achievements of the Indonesian House of Representatives in 2011-2012, which became the focus of this research, were successful in proposing an agenda for discussing integration and establishing cohesiveness in ASEAN regarding regional security regarding the South China Sea conflict. In the assembly, they agreed to change the Solution to South China Sea Problem to Maintaining Peace and Stability in the region with the consideration that AIPA could drive the government to resolve the problem by peaceful means (BKASP DPR RI, 2012).

## **V. The House of Representatives of the Republic Indonesia Agenda in AIPA 2011-2012**

During Indonesia's leadership in AIPA, the dispute of the South China Sea was turbulent due to absolute claims and aggression of the People's Republic of China (PRC) war forces in this area, which were unilateral claims by Beijing. The PRC's claim was later followed by its rival, fellow claimant to territorial sovereignty in the South China Sea. Thus, the open war between China and the disputed ASEAN countries can occur. ASEAN as a fully integrated community is highly dependent on Indonesia's active role. Based on the affirmation of Indonesia's position and attitude at the parliamentary level, Marzuki Alie, the chairman of the Indonesian House of Representatives and president of AIPA 2011-2012 (AIPA Secretariat, 2011), said:

It is time for ASEAN to be more proactive and show its credibility as a regional cooperation organization that helps its member states by attaining the ASEAN Community in 2015. In conflict resolution, Indonesia, during its ASEAN Chairmanship, is strongly committed to encouraging peaceful resolution of conflicts that occur in the region through negotiation and peaceful means for the sake of the achievement of the ASEAN Political-Security Community. In this regard, the Indonesian House of Representatives highly appreciated and was encouraged by the effort to promote peaceful cooperation and progress towards a lasting solution to the South China Sea. 2012 (AIPA Secretariat, 2011)

The House of Representatives of Republic Indonesia complemented what has been done at the executive level. As part of multi-track diplomacy, the Indonesian House of Representatives plays a vital role in creating a dialogue space for various stakeholders in the Southeast Asian region within the parliamentary framework. The initiative is implemented through Indonesia's involvement, particularly in AIPA. Thus, it created the alignment of attitudes with the executive at the international level. Furthermore, at the executive level (ASEAN forum), Indonesia continued to create a safe, peaceful, and stable South China Sea area through various diplomatic efforts. In 2012, responding to different views in responding to the situation in the South China Sea, the Indonesian Foreign Minister on 18-19 July 2012 conducted intensive approaches and consultations (shuttle diplomacy) with ASEAN Foreign Ministers regarding their joint position (Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia, 2013).

These efforts have resulted in the agreement of ASEAN's Six-Point Principles on the South China Sea on July 20, 2012. It also affirmed the actions of executive diplomacy at the ASEAN level. The 33rd President of AIPA hoped that Cambodia could encourage ASEAN to play a more active role in providing consultation and negotiation spaces that are constructive, solution-based, effective, and strategic among parties directly involved in resolving disputes over the China Sea area. ASEAN has a peaceful manner, using non-military force, and promoting the spirit of togetherness between ASEAN and ASEAN partners. The South China Sea issue is a very sensitive conflict and is perceived as a complex problem. Indonesia's trying to find an effective and peaceful solution to the South China Sea issue. Indonesia implements positive engagement through consultative and negotiating that takes place constructively.

## VI. Conclusion

The parliamentary diplomacy practice, conducted by the House of Representatives of Indonesia (DPR RI), highlights how Indonesia implements total diplomacy with a free-active ideology that functions as multi-track diplomacy. By placing ASEAN as the first concentric circle, Indonesia's foreign policy has been supported by the Indonesian House of Representatives in implementing diplomacy in the AIPA forum, especially since the establishment of AIPA. The Indonesian Parliament has always played an active role in every forum. Indonesia's national interests do not just stop in the hands of the executive but need to be supported by the Indonesian Parliament, which was evident from the similarity of Indonesia's attitude in the ASEAN Summit forum and the AIPA General Assembly, especially the Indonesian leadership in 2011-2012.

What has become a focus for Indonesia in the ASEAN and AIPA forums is the need for proactive and confident actions in carrying out the foreign policy so as not to be stuck or exploited by the interests of hegemonic countries or great powers, especially countries that are dialogue partners in ASEAN. In the view of structural realism, where the weak power becomes the object of the great power state, it can be manifested as a threat to ASEAN. Therefore, Indonesia's seriousness in the AIPA and ASEAN forums needs to be concretely actualized, especially border conflicts between countries and common issues such as the South China Sea dispute. ASEAN has made good progress as a regionalism. ASEAN cohesiveness is mandatory. If one member sided with one of the great powers, it would undoubtedly undermine the regional foundations in Southeast Asian regionalism.

The Indonesian House of Representatives conducts the Parliamentary

diplomacy of Indonesia needs to be considered by the Indonesian government (executive). It constantly strives as a supporter of executive diplomacy. The Indonesian Parliament should be active in international affairs through inter-parliamentary cooperation and parliamentary diplomacy and by contributing to and monitoring international negotiations, oversee what the government adopts decisions, and ensuring national compliance with international legal norms and rules.

### Works Cited

- AIPA Sekretariat, 2011. *Speech By H.E. Dr. Marxuki Ali at The First Plenary Session The 32nd Asean Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA)*, s.l.: s.n.
- Alami, A. N., 2011. Profil dan Orientasi Kebijakan Luar Negeri Indonesia Pasca Orde Baru. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik LIPI*, 8(2).
- Bennett, A. G. a. A., 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- BKASP DPR RI, 2012. *Diplomasi Parlemen Indonesia di Asia Tenggara*. Jakarta: Badan Kerja Sama Antar Parlemen DPR RI.
- BKSAP, n.d.. *Indonesia dalam Organisasi Inter-Parliamentary Union*. [Online] Available at: [http://dpr.go.id/dokakd/dokumen/BK\\_SAP-9-0e7fe7870e6d1a1cb42fbe6776c52001.pdf](http://dpr.go.id/dokakd/dokumen/BK_SAP-9-0e7fe7870e6d1a1cb42fbe6776c52001.pdf) [Accessed 8 September 2020].
- DPR RI, 2011. *Komisi I DPR RI Kunjungi Amerika Serikat Bahas Kerjasama Pertahanan*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.dpr.go.id/berita/detail/id/2736> [Accessed 12 September 2020].
- Fiott, D., 2011. On the Value of Parliamentary Diplomacy. *Madariaga Paper*, 4(7).
- Götz, N., 2005. On the Origins of Parliamentary Diplomacy Scandinavian Bloc Politics and Delegation Policy in the League of Nations. *Cooperation and Conflict. Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, 40(3).
- Goumenos, T., 2018. *Parliamentary Diplomacy as 'Track 1 1/2 Diplomacy' in Conflict Resolution*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/07/11/parliamentary-diplomacy-as-track-1-1-2-diplomacy-in-conflict-resolution/> [Accessed 20 October 2019].
- Hudson, V. M., 2014. *Foreign Policy Analysis, Classic and Contemporary Theory*. 2nd ed. Lanhan, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union, n.d. *History*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.ipu.org/about-us/history> [Accessed 8 September 2020].
- Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia, 2013. *Isu Khusus :Laut China Selatan*. [Online] Available at: [https://kemlu.go.id/portal/id/read/101/halaman\\_list\\_lainnya/laut-china-selatan](https://kemlu.go.id/portal/id/read/101/halaman_list_lainnya/laut-china-selatan) [Accessed 12 September 2020].
- Kementrian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia, n.d.. *Keanggotaan Indonesia dalam Organisasi Internasional*. [Online] Available at: <https://kemlu.go.id/download/L3NpdGVzL3B1c2F0L0RvY3VtZW50cy9LZWFuZ2dvdGFhbl9JbmRvbmVzaWFfcGFkYV9PSS5wZGY=> [Accessed 9 September 2020].
- Ma'mun, A. S., 2009. *Citra Indonesia di Mata Dunia: Gerakan Kebebasan Indormasi dan Diplomasi Publik*. Bandung: Asosiasi Ilmu Politik Indonesia (AIPi).
- Miall, H. O. R. a. T. W., 2015. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management And Transformation Of Deadly Conflicts*. 2nd ed. Cambridge & Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Noulas, G., 2011. *The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy in Foreign Policy*. [Online] Available at:



- <https://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2011/10/22/the-role-of-parliamentary-diplomacy-in-foreign-policy/>  
[Accessed 20 Oktober 2020].
- Robertson, J., 2007. *North Korean Nuclear Issues And The Role Of Parliamentary Diplomacy*. Parliamentary Library, s.l.: s.n.
- Schiff, A., 2010. Quasi Track-One Diplomacy: An Analysis of the Geneva Process in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict. *International Studies Perspectives*, 11(2).
- Wicaksana, I. G. W., 2019. *Ambivalensi Indonesia di ASEAN*. [Online] Available at: Wicaksana, I Gede Wah<https://koran.tempo.co/read/opini/420657/ambivalensi-indonesia-di-asean?>  
[Accessed 12 September 2020].
- Wirajuda, N. H., 2006. *Seminar Tahunan Mengenang Tokoh Diplomasi Dr. Moh. Hatta*, Jakarta: s.n.