

DIPLOMATIC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVES ON FORMULATING AND ARTICULATING INDONESIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Ratih Herningtyas, Surwandono, Tulus Warsito
Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta

ABSTRACT

This paper tries to discuss diplomatic governance study on Indonesian decision-making and implementing foreign policy. Diplomatic governance is a concept that is adopted from democratic study on how to manage transparent and accountable policy decision-making. The discourse on diplomatic governance is expected to improve effectively and efficiency of Indonesian foreign policy in achieving its national interests.

Foreign policy that will be the focus of this paper is Indonesian foreign policy of administrative-based economy. In the last 10 years, this policy have been faced serious contraction problems such as corruption, lack of protection of Indonesian citizen abroad and crisis on law-politics issues such as dispute resolution in International Court of Justice in the case of Sipadan and Ligitan Islands.

This paper considers that the lacks of effective and efficient of Indonesian foreign policy in articulating Indonesia's national interests in international fora are closely related to the low governance negotiation discourse in the formulation and implementation of Indonesia's foreign policy.

Keywords: *Diplomacy practise, Foreign Policy Decision making, Diplomatic Governance*

Introduction

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Indonesia has a main role in initiating strategies and formulating Indonesian foreign policy. Indonesia possesses a platform of free and active foreign policy platform, a strategic platform which brings Indonesia as an essential pillar in regional and international forums. The platform has been implemented by Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia for 65 years passing various dynamics and issues.

Supporting effectiveness of foreign policy implementation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs has 119 overseas offices, 3,700 staffs that 900 staffs act as diplomatic staffs.¹ The number of staffs is considered as adequately greater than the

¹ Stated by Teuku Faizasyah to Anantara news in a news column entitled *Reformasi Tanpa Renumerasi Deplu Tersandung Kasus Korupsi*, Monday, 1 March 2010. Retrieved from <http://infokorupsi.com/id/korupsi.php?ac=5252&1=reformasi-tanpa-renumerasi-deplu-tersandung-kasus-korupsi>.

number of diplomatic staffs of the other Southeast Countries. Additionally, Indonesia provides extensive space for Commission I of House of Representatives, focusing on foreign interest, to assist and evaluate foreign policy made by Foreign Affairs Ministry.

In 2008, Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs achieved ISO 9001, an award representing that Indonesia Foreign Department reformed quality management as the commitment to bureaucracy reform. Attaining the ISO, it is expected that roles, duties, principles, and function of foreign department on articulating national interests through formulating and implementing foreign policy would be effective.

Nevertheless, the prestigious predicate does not guarantee the performance quality of this department, noticing a number of weakness as dispute resolution of Sipadan and Ligitan Islands, many Indonesian labors upstaged inhumanly in several countries like Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Kuwait, Japan, China, as well as the lateness of evacuation process of Indonesian people in several conflicted countries. Another example is that Indonesian government was unable to renegotiate various foreign investment contracts and security as well as sovereign intervention of other countries.

On the other hand, there are some practices to appreciate. Based on analysts' perspectives, Indonesian diplomatic capacity undertaken by President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono tended to display graphic lifting. Bantarto Bandoro noted the achievement of President SBY in various international forums as cases of Climate Changes, ASEAN democratization, and active involvement in peace issues in Middle East that Indonesiannotions were acceded in international public.²

Literature Review

In International Relation Dictionary, foreign policy refers to planned strategies formulated by decision makers of a state to another state or certain international agency to achieve specific goals regarding national interests.³ Foreign policy is considered as a representative of national political power of a state. Besides, diplomacy emerges as relation activities among countries carried out by an actor, namely a diplomat, through a diplomatic dictum. Therefore, it is necessary the existence of an agency to arrange agendas and strategic plans for a state.

International Relations researchers have been interested in a study of diplomatic roles and interconnections with foreign policy. Generally, the Oxford Dictionary defines that diplomacy refers to management of international relations by negotiation. Diplomacy is a diplomatic instrument to diminish inclination of states to have conflict and war by considering the huge damages due to the previous

² See in Bantarto Bandoro, "Raihan Besar Diplomasi Indonesia", *Indo Pos*, December 4, 2008.

³ Jack C. Plano and Roy Olton, in *the International Relations Dictionary* (New York: Holt, Rinehart andWinston, 2008), p. 127.

world wars. However, diplomatic concepts, diplomacy, and relations with national interests of a state turn controversy among International Relations scholars.

In classical realism perspectives, Hans Morgenthau conveyed that diplomatic approaches would be employed by the ones who are against or afraid of power. The belief bears a classical proverb "*diplomacy without power is like music without instruments.*" Thus, Morgenthau was a skeptic of the diplomacy concepts and diplomacy in its roles to reduce the use of physical power or coercion to attain national interest of a state.

Several fundamental views of classical realism on diplomatic roles of a state are written as follows:⁴

1. The attendance of a state is represented by statesmen to settle in another state. They have to control, monitor, and be responsible for the state responses to answer the international political changes (Morgenthau, 2008: 118)
2. Statesmen obligate to express their voice in diplomacy, determine aims of state involvement in convention or treaty, select and regulate how to achieve the aims, maintain, elevate, and demonstrate the state power.
3. For realists, it is appropriate for showing exclusive impression to diplomats or statesmen since they possess strengths as autonomous behavior, namely special treatment that somebody likely makes decision on behalf of a state.
4. Regarding foreign policy, a state is more prioritizing public and domestic economy. Hence, foreign policy points at fostering domestic material resource and political support. Foreign national power achievement hinges on abilities of state officials in constructing public opinions and education foreign policy to public.

Based on the classic realist perspectives, diplomats or foreign affairs officials ought to be able to share information of facts of a negotiation or foreign policy to Indonesian people in and outside Indonesia. It is expected to encourage transparency of policy so that foreign policy gets permission from public. Moreover, Indonesia is now encountering democracy. The people are accustomed to something transparent and accountable. According to Marijke Breuning (2007), accountability of the foreign policy context refers to notions that decision makers are unable to undertake but should be responsible for their decision and action, and should elucidate the rationalization to public they lead.

Roles of Ministry of Foreign Affairs have been discussed by G.R. Bridge (2008). Bridge attempted to explain history and significance of the existence of state agency, MFA, having proliferated. Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been established since 17th century, particularly in Europe, to take roles of diplomatic

⁴ See Michael Mastanduno, David A. Lake and G. John Ikenberry in *Toward a Realist Theory of State Action*, *International Studies Quarterly*, 2008. p. 460-461.

interests, from diplomacy to formulation and execution of foreign policy. Bridge noted that the proliferation of diplomats in European classical era was due to the understanding of diplomatic activity urgency. At the beginning of diplomatic term and roles, there were number of diplomatic activities terminating inconsistently. It emerged various violations and inappropriateness done by statesmen. Thus, the issue triggered a notion to constitute diplomatic roles of a state by improving data management, procedure, protocol, secretarial work, and responsibility sharing. In fact, the reason underlying the establishment of Ministry of Foreign Affairs is to conduct recruitment, clarify, send, defray, and maintain regular and safe communication with foreign diplomatic representatives.

A study of William D. Coplin was very fruitful to categorize foreign policy in three main categories.⁵ **First**, it is a general decision. It refers to the basis of foreign policy so that it would become blue-print of each process of decision making. To reinforce the decision platform, the process should be carried out deeply and should engage in many parties. The foreign actor is high-level executive as president, prime minister, or officials who have equal position to pope in Vatican. Therefore, in diplomatic session, there is summit diplomacy meaning a form of negotiation by a leader of state and government to cope with cases regarding international life. In the context, the executive is required to gather accurate data so that the decision would not bring adverse impacts on himself as a national political actor and his country as international relations actor.

Second, it is an administrative decision. The administrative decision, according to D. Coplin, refers to an operational decision undertaken daily by a state as an international actor. Thus, the administrative decision has greater technical dimension than philosophical dimension. Nevertheless, it does not mean that the administrative could be performed simply. Instead, it would display whether or not a general decision of a state is effective. Hence, the administrative decision possesses a role to criticize the general decision.

Related to an ongoing process of a state, there would be a standard of operating procedure to implement the general policy to be administrative policy. For instance, duties and authorities of diplomats and officials have had the outlines. They may not make decision out of the determined frame. If they would make decision out of the frame based on consideration of effectiveness, they ought to consult with their higher structural parties.

Third, it is a crisis decision. Based on D. Coplin, the crisis decision was indicated by several characters:

- a. Limited available data
- b. Limited available time

⁵ See William D. Coplin, *Politik Internasional: Perumusan Kebijakan Luar Negeri*, (translation), Jakarta, Ghalia Ilmu, 2010

- c. Threatened state interests
- d. Short-term dimension in certain boundary

In the characters, it could be noticed that a foreign decision maker ought to respond international phenomena soon without involving many people, even without using available data (since the data is unavailable or there is no time to employ the data). In the circumstance, based on perspective theory, an actor would tend to use his experience in confronting similar phenomena (trigger-event). Foreign policy in crisis dimension is reflected in foreign decision-making dealing with war on another state or certain groups considered disrupting national security of a state.

A critical study of policy-making and foreign policy practice has been examined by international relations researchers. The critical group was inclined to employ instrumental approach to reveal deviation of foreign policy-making. The approach assumes that there are broad spaces for elites in the process of decision-making to insert their own interests and the group's.⁶

International relations researchers have evolved theory of actor instrumentation in decision-making and diplomatic practice. First, a study of rational choice theory and rational actor's model in instrumentalist's perspectives has been fostered by Michel Hechter (1996; 1986)⁷ and Michael Banton (1994; 1996).⁸ According to Hetcher, the involvement of somebody in a conflict or negotiation is as an actor's instrument to articulate individual interests in gaining wealth, prestige, and power. In the context of an elite study of Bachtton, dynamics of conflict and negotiation are determined by preference of elites' interests in utilizing the conflict and negotiation to construct legitimation. Banton's findings reinforced Hetcher's study that conflict and negotiation are mostly manipulated by actors to articulate their interests instead of public interests.⁹

In the context of diplomatic regime construction choice, political position of a diplomatic actor would affect the diplomatic actors' choice on diplomatic regime construction. A diplomatic actor should have tough legitimation basis since

⁶ See Surwandono, *Instrumetasi Pilihan Kebijakan Pemerintah Filipina dan Nur Misuari Dalam Regim Negosiasi Final Peace Agreement 1996*, Research document PHK A3 International Relations Department UMY, 2010.

⁷ Michael Hechter, "Ethnicity and Rational Choice Theory", in John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith (eds.), UK: Oxford University Press and Michael Hechter, (1986) 'A rational choice approach to race and ethnic relations', in D. Mason and J. Rex (eds.) *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. For more detail see Surwandono, *Kegagalan Regim Negosiasi Final Peace Agreement 1996 Dalam penyelesaian Konflik Mindanaoun*, published Thesis FISIPOL UGM, 2011.

⁸ Michael Banton, (1994) 'Modeling ethnic and national relations,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 17 (1) and Michael Banton (1996) 'The Actor's Model of Ethnic Relations', in John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith (eds), *Ethnicity (Oxford Reader)*, UK: Oxford University Press. For more discussion see Surwandono, *ibid*.

⁹Michael Banton, *ibid*.

diplomatic instruments would strengthen and broaden the actor's diplomacy. Therefore, diplomatic regime construction-based Getting it Done in rational choice theory is a more rational choice for the actor possessing a strong basis of legitimation. On contrast, a diplomatic actor having a weak legitimation should undertake diplomatic instrument to maintain and reinforce the actor's legitimation in public. Thus, diplomatic regime construction-based Getting to Yes in rational choice theory is more rational for the actor who overcomes legitimation issues.

Diplomatic instrumentation in certain boundary assumes that a diplomatic actor is more exclusive than other diplomatic stakeholders. In the exclusive diplomatic structure, diplomatic instrumentation possesses several significant implications. **First**, a diplomatic actor has a great occasion to manipulate negotiated political positions to his and his group's interests. The target of political interest manipulation is pointed to the diplomatic opponents or constituents of the actor.

Second, the manipulation process drives rhythm of diplomatic institution go to positional diplomacy that diplomatic actors prefer articulating required political positions in diplomacy than articulating to moderate conflict resolution. The diplomatic actor undertakes it in order that his political position after the diplomacy could be maintained or even promoted in social and political relations.

Third, the diplomatic instrumentation of the diplomatic actor tends to conduct political alienation of public participation in the diplomatic process. The diplomatic actor argues that public participation in positional diplomacy would hamper agreement of diplomatic process due to more accommodated interests. The diplomatic actor also contends that public participation would diminish the result of political interests, prosperity, and power of the diplomatic actor, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Diplomatic instrumentation might disregard diplomatic principles of conflict resolution. John Darcy stated that negotiation actors ought to set out the following principles:

(1) the protagonists must be willing to negotiate in good faith; (2) the key actors must be included in the process; (3) the negotiations must address the central issues in the dispute; (4) force must not be used to achieve objectives; and (5) negotiators must be committed to a sustained process.¹⁰

According to John Darby, actors' diplomatic instrumentation would bring two huge problems in diplomacy, namely actor reduction and problem reduction. Actor reduction causes that the interest of actors, who do not engage in the diplomacy, could be articulated well so that it would emerge issues in ratification level, rule-making, implementation, and monitoring. Problem reduction would affect discussion displacement of diplomatic, from substantive issues to artificial issues.

¹⁰ John Darby, *The Effects of Violence on Peace Processes*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2001, p. 11.

The diplomatic discussion, which would then focus on artificial issues, would cause that the diplomatic yield is not sufficient to resolve issues.

This research would attempt to provide new understanding of diplomatic instrumentation of diplomatic actors. A thesis of diplomatic instrumentation by Rizal Buendia tried to formulate rational actor model of Michael Hetcher and Banton to arrange diplomatic settings as actor media to articulate individual interests in gaining wealth, prestige, and power which effect on difficulty level confronted by the actor in diplomatic process. The difficulty emerges since the diplomatic actor manipulates political position for his or his group's interest. The manipulation process enacts rhythm of diplomatic institution go to positional diplomacy that diplomatic actors prefer articulating required political positions in diplomatic than articulating to moderate conflict resolution. The diplomatic actor undertakes it in order that his political position after the diplomacy could be maintained or even promoted in social and political relations. The diplomatic instrumentation of the diplomatic actor tends to conduct political alienation of public participation in the diplomatic process. The diplomatic actor argues that public participation in positional diplomacy would hamper agreement of diplomatic process due to more accommodated interests. The diplomatic actor also contends that public participation would diminish the result of political interests, prosperity, and power of the diplomatic actor, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The diplomatic instrumentation might ignore diplomatic principles.

The researchers evolved new understanding that diplomatic instrumentation in certain boundary is a creative way to make innovation in politics and economy and to encounter conflicts in center and areas of separatism. Nevertheless, diplomatic instrumentation choice and level should be equal to powerful political legitimation.

Diplomatic actors having powerful legitimation possess influential authority to carry out diplomatic instrumentation through activities breaking down the issues till the basic issues to formulate policies and to create new construction of conflict resolution. The instrumentation having powerful legitimation tends to be more accountable and manageable so that the diplomatic instrumentation most likely could resolve the conflicts.

Diplomatic actors having low legitimation tend to conduct unaccountable diplomatic instrumentation and often break their authority borders. The diplomatic actors consider how the diplomacy could run and utilize it to foster their legitimation in public. The choice of unaccountable diplomacy would bring broad impacts on diplomatic regime construction or diplomatic regime implementation. On the other hand, the diplomatic instrument process of low political legitimation actors might become unaccountable and manageable or it might turn into a medium of resolving conflicts of actors, rather resolving conflicts of public.

Definition of Diplomatic Governance

Diplomatic governance is a novel concept which only a few has inserted it in diplomatic literatures. The concept was revealed by the researchers' dissertation at Political Studies of UGM in 2011 entitled "*Kegagalan Regim Negosiasi Final Peace Agreement 1996 Sebagai Formula Penyelesaian Konflik Mindanao*" (Negotiation Regime Failure of Final Peace Agreement 1996 as Conflict Resolution of Mindanao). In classical International Relations, diplomacy possesses exclusive, complicated, and top secret spaces. Diplomacy is extravagant political activities which only actors having remarkable capability could carry out so that they represent a country's interests broadly. The exclusive negotiation is designed conservatively so that public has less curiosity and attendance of diplomatic activities. Diplomatic practice effectiveness of national interests is not determined by the diplomats' performance instead of public involvement in formulating or implementing diplomacy.

The circumstance enables to emerge oligarchy phenomena in formulating foreign policy as mentioned in a study of democracy. Oligarchy in foreign decision-making of open global system would be a harmful result of national interests. Complicated issues necessitate public participation in providing recommendation and support so that the decision of Ministry of Foreign Affairs represents public choice.

Classical proverb stated that diplomats are required to lie to attain more irrelevant national interests. Information system has been widely opened, and rapid accessibility would affect that people would prefer lying or hiding facts and it makes the conflict get worse. Courage of appreciating information and then forming it to be more productive is much better than limiting the information.

In this context, diplomatic governance has significant roles. **First**, it provides an alternative of accountable foreign policy formulation to gain national interests. Foreign policy has tend to be exclusive that public has less participation in the policy formulation. Public only obtain various socializations of policy. Therefore, this research aims at providing strategic formulation in accountable achievement of implementing diplomatic governance. The implementation would reinforce the precision of decision-making which expected to elevate productivity of policy in resolving various national issues.¹¹

Making more accountable foreign policy would give great occasion for public to undertake fit and proper toward policies of Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The public participation is not merely dealing with receiving socialization of policies, which would be implemented or have been implemented. The socialization is often claimed as public diplomacy by Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The choice of returning the perspectives of elites and civil society toward the public diplomacy notion, in

¹¹ Mulyadi M. Phillian, "Diplomasi Yang Sesungguhnya", *Sinar Harapan*, June 20, 2005.

fact, would make Ministry of Foreign Affairs a democratic department, and it would not be blamed if defaults exist on the implementation of decision-making.

In sensitive context entailing solidarity mobility as an Indonesia diplomatic case to negotiate principles of colonialism and racialism, public participation became new ammunition for Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Nevertheless, the department has not optimized yet roles of civil organization to strengthen Indonesian diplomacy in international forum. Indonesian diplomacy in solidarity issue has been mostly succeeded, yet reinforcing diplomatic governance through public participation would enhance the achievement of Indonesia in implementing UUD 1945.

Second, diplomatic governance provides alternative of formulating transparent foreign policy to diminish various possibility of deviation which could bother the achievement of national interest. It is in line with more challenges encountered by Indonesian government to articulate the achievement national interests getting more competitive in international forum. In classical diplomatic era, transparency implies one of the avoided diplomatic values that the more we could close other accessibilities to us, the greater we could negotiate our interest. Hence, it might be true that a diplomat is required to lie since the diplomacy is art of lying, indeed.

Diplomatic governance puts tradition of transparency as a strategic value to conceptualize and actualize better national interests. The transparency enables Ministry of Foreign Affairs to gain broader, faster, and more efficient information. On the other hand, the policy choice might be more opened affecting difficulties in formulating the best policy. Diplomatic strength is diplomatic capability to gather a lot of information because the broader information we have, the more we could win over others efficiently. Diplomatic achievement is not represented to the extent which we could cover our weaknesses, it is presented to the extent that we have information as well as productive contribution and zero in on our targets and others. It is not necessary to hide our weaknesses since they would be covered by our strengths.

In Indonesian blue-collar workers (TKI), actualization of Indonesian foreign policy to save its citizens is not effective. Ministry of Foreign Affairs tends to conceal facts and would clarify after media share the issues to public. The increasing of migrant workers' issues could boomerang Indonesian foreign policy. Moratorium of sending TKI is contended as reactionary policy which is not productive for national interests of Indonesia. Many workers are disappointed at the policy because it is considered to hamper workers to obtain sufficient earning.

In an issue of complicated passport and visa-making, going abroad or coming to Indonesia is hampered. A little information transparency causes illegal tariff or scalpers in administration services. A lot of higher education complains visa making policy for foreign students since it could reduce the interest of foreigners to study at

universities in Indonesia. Diplomatic governance enables administrative foreign policy making process could be measurable and objective so that traffic in goods, services, and people in Indonesia turns more efficient.

Diplomatic transparency delimitates spaces to do financial or authority corruption. There recent three years, Ministry of Foreign Affairs has confronted stigma regarding corruption of goods, services, or authority in several embassies. An analysis of Hikmawanto Juwono in his article entitled "*Diplomasi Indonesia Belum bertaji*" in Kompas Newspaper on October 8, 2005, displayed that practices of Indonesia diplomacy are corruptive and high-cost, yet it was not in line with the achievement.¹² Diplomatic governance would assist Ministry of Foreign Affairs more clean and productive department.

Third, diplomatic governance provides an alternative of formulating foreign policy upholding values of fairness to reduce possibilities of elite transactional foreign policy which harms national interests of Indonesia. As the researchers' study of a conflict in Mindanao, the most enormous failure in regime of Final Peace Agreement 1996 was lack of fairness in negotiation process. A willingness to capitalize negotiation as a main medium to attain authority turned into the positional negotiation, and ultimately it was for coping with issues of elites or negotiating actors instead of the main issue.

A classical proverb mentioned that our achievement in diplomacy is how we could manipulate our interest toward others. The better we undertake manipulation politics of interests, the grater diplomatic achievement we gain. The proverb is apparently irrelevant. In extremely great diplomatic interaction among countries, we do not conduct diplomacy in a diplomatic session. Intensive diplomatic frequency drives diplomatic choice demand manipulative polite logical reasoning which is not productive, indeed.

Foreign policy of Indonesia in articulating issues of territories should be established based on adequate documents. A case resolution of Sipadan and Ligitan through international arbitration necessitating argumentation based on objective document turned into a valuable experience that negotiation in manipulative argumentation is contra-productive. So did a diplomatic issue of climate change. Geographically, Indonesia is located in tropical and strategic area to take roles in diplomacy. Indonesia achieved carbon credit by carbon-producing countries for reforestation in Indonesia. The fund was supposed to be utilized objectively to public, rather than ended for political campaigns in media and seminar. Indonesian government honesty to allocate the reforestation fund in proper sectors would lift public trust to Indonesian diplomatic activities. Capability of Indonesia in assigning the carbon credit fund to appropriate places would elevate the name of Indonesia as a responsible country.

¹²See Hikmawanto Juwono, "*Diplomasi Indonesia Belum Bertaji*", *Kompas* October 5, 2005.

Conclusion

To sum up, there are three main conclusions. First, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia has possessed political will to be a well-managed organization. It has proven by the achievement of ISO 2008. Second, diplomacy of Indonesia has displayed fluctuating phenomena these recent 10 years. It shows an achievement, yet also addresses recession and corruption. It could be resolved if Ministry of Foreign Affairs embarks adopting the notion of diplomatic governance, a process of diplomatic management upholding values of accountability, transparency, and fairness. Third, Formulation and Implementation of Indonesian foreign policy employing a paradigm of diplomatic governance would elevate capacity and productivity of Indonesia foreign policy based on Free and Active Principles.

REFERENCES

- Bandoro, Bantarto, "Raihan Besar Diplomasi Indonesia", *Indo Pos*, December 4, 2008.
- Banton, Michael 'Modeling Ethnic and National Relations,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 17, 2004.
- Coplin, William D., *Politik Internasional: Perumusan Kebijakan Luar Negeri*, (terjemahan), Jakarta, Ghalia Ilmu, 2010.
- Darby, John, *The Effects of Violence on Peace Processes*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2001.
- Hechter, Michael, 'A Rational Choice Approach to Race and Ethnic Relations', in D. Mason and J. Rex (eds) *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , Michael, "Ethnicity and Rational Choice Theory", in John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith (eds), UK: Oxford University Press and Michael Hechter, (1986).
- Leifer, Michael, *Politik Luar Negeri Indonesia*, Jakarta, Gramedia, 2005.
- Juwono, Hikmawanto, "Diplomasi Indonesia Belum Bertaji", *Kompas* October 5, 2005
- Mastanduno, Michael, David A. Lake and G. John Ikenberry, "Toward a Realist Theory of State Action", *International Studies Quarterly*, 2008.
- Michael Banton 'The Actor's Model of Ethnic Relations', in John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith (eds), *Ethnicity (Oxford Reader)*, UK: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Mulyadi, M. Phillian, "Diplomasi yang Sesungguhnya", *Sinar Harapan*, June 20, 2005.
- Plano, Jack C. and Roy Olton, *The International Relations Dictionary*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 2008.

Surwandono, *Instrumetasi Pilihan Kebijakan Pemerintah Filipina dan Nur Misuari dalam Regim Negosiasi Final Peace Agreement 1996*, Naskah Riset PHK A3 Jurusan HI UMY, 2010.

-----, *Kegagalan Regim Negosiasi Final Peace Agreement 1996 dalam Penyelesaian Konflik Mindanao*, unpublished Disertation, FISIPOL UGM, 2011.

<http://infokorupsi.com/id/korupsi.php?ac=5252&1=reformasi-tanpa-renumerasi-deplu-tersandung-kasus-korupsi>.