Indonesian Diplomacy in the Digital World

Ganewati Wuryandari*

[*Abstract*]

In the 21ˢᵗ century, the growing use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) and social media platforms has influenced our way of life, including international diplomacy. With the use of new interactive communication technologies such as WhatsApp, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, video sharing website, blogs, and other social media networks, digital diplomacy has become an active diplomatic mode in modern society and plays an increasing important role in international relations. Although Indonesia has gradually realized the pivotal role of internet diplomacy and recently put it into practice, it is still lagging far behind. This paper will examine how Indonesia conducts its diplomacy in the new era of digital world. How far and in what ways does the Indonesian government make use of digital technology to conduct its diplomacy? What opportunities and challenges are confronted to develop digital diplomacy? How does it navigate diplomacy in the digital age? Unless Indonesia embraces new channels and methods of diplomacy, its foreign policy implementation may not run optimally to support its aim of attaining its objectives in the international stage.

Keywords: Indonesia, Foreign Policy, National Interests, Digital Diplomacy

* A researcher and Head of Research Center for Regional Resources, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (P2SDR-LIPI), ndari_ganewati@yahoo.com

Ⅰ. Introduction

Alfin Toffler's *Future Shock* in 1970, opened the eyes of many people to the world's immense changes shaped by the rapid development of the information and communication technologies (ICTs). The world is already experiencing the so-called "third wave of change" with the emergence of an information society (Toffler 1989: 17), which is different from an asymmetric information society of the previous era when information was mostly accessible to certain circles. Nowadays, information can be easily spread and may be accessed by everybody. This revolutionary change signifies the success of new ICTs and social media platforms, such as the internet, mobile phones, and more recently social media applications like Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, Twitter, Reddit, Vine, Ask.fm, Tumblir, and Flickr. Not only has there been an increase in the speed and the efficiency of information dissemination; new digital technology also stimulated people's participation in connecting with the world. Over 2.4 billion people around the world have to access to the internet, accounting for 3.3 percent of the world's population (Jiang 2013: 1).

The emergence of internet and digital technology revolutionized human interaction, including foreign relations. States are now employing the Internet and digital electronic technologies in diplomacy. Such technology has also become pivotal to support the interests of respective states in the international stage. Many countries employ digital technology tools to engage, coordinate, and influence one another in an increasingly crowded environment of international actors. The importance of digital technology in diplomatic activities was described by Julian Borger, Jennifer Rankin and Kate Lyonas in this manner: "when the world's nations sit down to talk, for example, influence is no longer defined by special alliances, but which WhatsApp group you are invited into" (Borger et al. 2016).

Indeed, diplomacy that relies on the digital electronic devices or digital diplomacy has already significantly grown in many countries. Countries such as the United States of America, and the United Kingdom have seriously maximized the progress of modern

technology and the potential of the virtual world to promote their interests. The US leads in the application of digital technology in foreign policy. In 2002, the super power organized a task force in its State Department which specifically deals with e-Diplomacy. Similarly, the UK is also leading in digital diplomacy, as it published a digital strategy in 2012 and established a Digital Transformation Unit within its Foreign Affairs Office (Cave 2015).

Indonesia also engages in digital diplomacy, though it is yet to catch up. Its Ministry of Foreign Affairs only had its website (www.kemlu.go.id) in 1996, and its Twitter account 15 years after (Sudarma 2017). Obviously, digital diplomacy remains a challenge for Indonesia as far as foreign policy is concerned, considering that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs only has 132 representative offices in 96 foreign countries. Internet and social media are yet to be tapped to the fullest to ensure the speed of dissemination and accuracy of information between the headquarters and the representatives, with regards to foreign policy.

Moreover the age of mass information poses challenges and threats to Indonesia. For example, the active and ongoing Papuan independence campaign in the virtual world undermines Indonesian national sovereignty, a crucial concern in Indonesian foreign policy (Tantowi 2016). The vigorous virtual independence campaign needs to be immediately addressed to protect Indonesian integrity. Unless Indonesia embraces digital diplomacy, its foreign policy implementation may not run optimally to support its aim of attaining its objectives in the international stage.

Therefore, it is very important to analyze Indonesia's diplomacy in the digital world. Three key questions are raised in this essay: (1) how far and in what ways does the Indonesian government use digital technology to conduct its diplomacy?; (2) what opportunities and challenges are confronted by Indonesia to develop its digital diplomacy?; and (3) how does Indonesia navigate diplomacy in the digital age? This essay will respond to these in its three sections, which began with this introduction. The introduction is followed by a brief explanation about how diplomacy was transformed by rapid developments of digital technology. The third

section examines the digital technology in Indonesian diplomacy, concluded in the end by a synthesis.

Ⅱ. A New World: Digital Technology Transforming Diplomacy

The definition of diplomacy has considerably changed in the 20th century. At the beginning of the century, diplomacy was described as "the means by which States throughout the world conduct their affairs in ways to ensure peaceful relations" (Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affair 2008). States undertake diplomacy in order to safeguard their respective national interests in the international forum. This concerns as much the promotion of political, economic, social cultural, or scientific relations.

Its definition and practice began to change following the events of the 1920s and 1930s, especially with the immense popularity of radio. Russia and Germany propagated their revolutionary ideas to neighboring countries by intensively using the radio. Radio broadcasts communicated directly to foreign populations, which circumvented their other governments. This ushered in a new, different, and more direct approach to diplomacy, where populations were effectively persuaded to policies. This new diplomacy was later known as a public diplomacy, which according to Jan Melissen in The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations, is the relationship between diplomats and the foreign publics with whom they work (Melissen 2005: xix).

After the said revolutions, the practice spread around the world. For this, the US utilized the Voice of America and the UK used the British Broadcasting Corporation's World Service (Rawnsley 1996). These platforms broadcasted in a variety of languages. As the Cold War intensified, direct communication with the hostile population helped in pacification.

Digital diplomacy emerged as the 20th century came to end. It also came with other names such as eDiplomacy, Internet Diplomacy, and Cyber Diplomacy. The US calls it as 21st Century Statecraft, while Canada and the European Union call it Open Policy

and e-diplomacy (Envoy Center for Digital Diplomacy 2014). First coined in 2001, digital diplomacy loosely refers to how a country uses the information and communication technologies (ICTs) and social media platforms to achieve foreign policy goals (Global Diplomactic Forum n.d).

The definition encapsulates two schools of thoughts regarding digital diplomacy. In the first one, digital technology is considered a new tool in the conduct of public diplomacy. Instead of addressing foreign publics via traditional means, one may do so as using Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp, Instagram, Reddit, Vine, Ask.fm, Tumblr, and Flickr. In the second one, digital technology is considered more than a new tool since it increases the ability to interact and engage with foreign publics, creating avenues of dialogue that facilitate relations. Digital diplomacy then is the use of technology to deliver soft power and public policy messages, engage with wider audiences, and use the feedback loop to better understand and deliver policy.

With the growing use of ICTs and social media platforms, diplomacy is no longer for elite diplomats but expands the field to common folk (Santana n.d) who may also influence diplomatic decisions. Nowadays, the boundaries among states, groups, and individuals in diplomacy are increasingly vague. Advancements brought everyone the opportunity to relate with other cultures. The availability of the Internet and social media applications provides more opportunities for public and private partnerships in diplomacy.

Digital technology has expanded the level of playing field in international relations for the non-state actors. They have emerged as powerful, non-political, commercial, economic, cultural, or trading actors in the international sphere. They have also an increasing role in determining decisions in international relations. Individuals or groups most affected by conflict, human rights abuses, climate change, or other global issues, for example, now contribute to the negotiation process and diplomacy. They use digital technology to tell their side of the story, propelling factual and sustained discussions to influence policy makers. This revolution in diplomacy was observed by Alec Ross, a senior adviser

for Hillary Clinton during her tenure as US Secretary of State from 2009 to early 2013:

> Traditionally, diplomatic engagement consisted largely of government-to-government interactions. In some instances, it was from government to people, such as with international broadcasting in the twentieth century. With the advent of social media and the rapid increase in mobile [technology] penetration, however, this engagement now increasingly takes place from people to government and from people to people. This direct link from citizens to government allows diplomats to convene and connect with non-traditional audiences, and in turn allows citizens to influence their government in ways that were not possible ten years ago (Ross 2011: 452).

In short, rapid changes in digital technology has tightened the nexus connecting diverse levels of diplomacy. Non-state actors, whether they be individuals and groups, now engage and influence people through various social media and online platforms. This certainly creates a new set of demands for state and governing officials who make key decisions.

Advancement in digital technology also prompted other challenges to diplomats in carrying out foreign policy. Technology makes information abundant and well circulated for everyone, but also makes it difficult to screen truthfulness. Accountability for these questionable information has been challenging and affect national stability and foreign relations. As one German diplomat noted in one case, he had to "fight on both fronts [to report what really happens in negotiations and correct what is reported by social media]" (Archetti 2010: 8)

Although digital technology poses a new set of challenges in diplomacy, it also brings potential benefits. Archetti noted three of them. First, advancements offer greater access to sources of information. Volumes of information are easily and cheaply available and more quickly to be accessed, from traditional to new media. Second, diplomats now have greater ease and efficiency in communication. Third, diplomats now may concentrate on their functions as analyzing situations, managing offices, and networking

in their posts (Archetti 2010: 8).

Ⅲ. Digital Technology and Indonesia's Diplomacy: New Opportunities and Challenges, and a Path to A Future

The new era of information technology has developed so rapidly. It has made the world a smaller, and has also made distance a non-essential as people may communicate and be informed wherever they are in real time. People now are also increasingly connected and free to get information from various sources. According to Martin and Jagla, social media is a key factor in these revolutionary movements (Martin and Jagla 2013: 8). This attracted people to engage in the Internet and social media. The enthusiasm is also stimulated by rapid infrastructure development and ease in purchasing smartphones. Based on internet world statistics, internet users around the world are estimated to be 3,731,973,423 last March 31, 2017. China is the world's top ranked internet user (731,434,547 users), followed by India (462,124,989 users), US (286,942,362 users), and Brazil (139,111,185 users). There are 132.700,000 internet users in Indonesia, five times the number of people in Australia, making it the fifth largest internet population in the world. Half or 50.3% of its total population (263,510,146) use the internet. This number a significant increase to 2014's 88.1 million (tekno.liputan6.com 24/10/2016)

Social media has also become an incredibly seductive platform throughout the globe. Through its many alluring forms of communication and entertainment, it attracts an increasing number of followers. According to eMarketer's "Worldwide Social Networks Users" report published in June 2016, active social media users registered globally is around 2.34 billion, or approximately 32% of the world's population. The 10 top social media sites in the world ranked in order are Facebook, You Tube, Instagram, Twitter, Reddit, Vine, Ask.fm, Tumblir, Flickr, and Google (Johnson 2016). In Indonesia, the most popular are Facebook, and YouTube (Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia 2016). Indonesia is also ranked the 5th largest Facebook user after China, USA, India, and

Brazil, with about 88,000,000 users, accounting for 33% of its population (Internet World Stats 2017). Indonesia is the world's fourth most populous nation and its citizens have taken to social media, to Twitter in particular, with such enthusiasm. Less than a year ago, Jakarta was named the number one Twitter city in the world.

<Fig. 1> The Indonesia Foreign Minister, Retno L.P. Marsudi, makes use of Insta Video to talk on "Digital for Humanity: Rakhine State." Source: www.instagram. com/kemluri/(Accessed Nov. 15, 2017).

The significant explosion of Internet and social media users both at the global and national levels has unavoidably affected the sphere of Indonesia's foreign policy and diplomacy. The most perceived impact, according to current Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Retno L.P. Marsud, may be seen in the real-time diplomacy effect that requires diplomats to adjust the way they think and work (Cave 2016).

<Fig. 2> President Jokowi's blog with the President of France, Emmanuel Marcon.
Source: www.youtube.com/watch? (Accessed Nov. 10, 2017)

<Fig. 3> Kemlu RI's Twitter.
Source: www.twitter.com/portal_kemlu_ri (Accessed Nov. 14, 2017)

On one side, diplomats need to change mindsets in embracing and rethinking how new technologies can represent Indonesia. On the other, times have changed and diplomat must always be ready to respond and direct the course of events in the fastest, most discerned manner. International events that happening thousands of miles from Jakarta must be addressed quickly and accurately if they matter to Indonesia's foreign policy (Sudarma 2017).

The rapid development of communication and information technology is also an opportunity to utilize it as an instrument to support Indonesian diplomacy. Siti Sofia Sudarma, director of Information and Media of the Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, believes that speed in news technologies efficiently help cascade information to 132 embassies, high commissions, and consulates in 96 countries. It has also become an important part of public (Sudarma 2017). Dissemination of information is important in both building public trust to Indonesian foreign policy and promoting good governance. Esti Andayani, director general of Information and Public Diplomacy, also maintains that the new era of information technology helps diplomats in their duties of speedily gathering information delivering perspectives to the home base (Kementerian Luar Negeri 2016).

Many countries in the West, aside from the US and UK have prioritized digital diplomacy in supporting global communication and policy. Over the past decade, the US has adjusted its diplomacy approaches to account for technology, and called its transformational diplomacy as "21st century statecraft" in 2009. The US State Department explains this diplomacy as "the complementing of traditional foreign policy tools with newly innovated and adapted instruments of statecraft than fully leverage the networks, technologies and demographics of our interconnected world" (Martin and Jagla 2013: 13; The Office of Electronic Information, Bureau of Public Affairs n.d). The US has acknowledged the increase of popular users of ICT and the varied set of actors influencing international relations debate, such as NGOs, foundations, transnational networks, and citizens themselves. The approach encouraged US diplomats to connect with the private sectors through these new resources as a means to create public-private partnerships (Paris 2013: 2). Subsequently, the State Department also employed in promoting American statecraft. Its efforts in digital diplomacy have led to extraordinary results. It has created many digital diplomacy programs and initiatives, such as DipNote, Digital Outreach Team, Opinion Space, Democracy Dialogues, and Civil Society 2.10. Its total Twitter and Facebook followers in May 2013 was 26 million (Paris 2013: 2). This, according to Fergus Hanson, transformed the State Department into a "de facto media empire" (Hanson 2012: 5).

Similarly, the UK also leads in digital diplomacy. According to the Digital Diplomacy Review 2016 (#DDR16), which assessed 1098 digital diplomacy assets used by 210 Ministry of Foreign Affairs' worldwide, the UK was rated best in the world for digital diplomacy. It defeated France and the US, which ranked second and third, respectively. The UK ranked first, given its network (268 Embassies, High Commissions, Consulates in 168 countries) is active in digital diplomacy. Its 700 official social media profiles across the world has seven million followers (Elliott 2017). The UK also develops its digital diplomacy strategies by way of the Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO) Social Media Guidelines (Foreign & Commonwealth Office n.d). Going beyond the numbers, Hugh Elliot, director of

communication of the FCO UK, names three reasons for the country's success: risk-taking, innovation, and a multi-media mindset in carrying digital diplomacy (Elliott 2017).

Indonesia has also embarked on digital diplomacy, though still on a limited scale (Yahya 2016). Based on the Digital Diplomacy Review 2016, Indonesia is ranked 37th digital diplomacy (http://digital.diplomacy.live. Accessed April 10, 2017). It ranked better than some of its Southeast Asian neighbors, though there is more space for improvement.

It lags behind in digital diplomacy because internet and social media were introduced a bit late. For instance, the Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has gone digital for just over a decade. It launched it website in 1996 (Sudarma 2017) and only acquired Twitter account on June 29, 2010 (https://twitter.com/Portal_Kemlu_RI. Accessed April 20, 2017), beginning an engagement with other popular social media platforms like Facebook, YouTube and Instagram. Its Twitter account is the most followed among the social media accounts <Table 1>.

<Table 1> The Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs's Website and Social Media as of April 20, 2017

	Website	Twitter	Facebook	Instagram	YouTube
Account name	http://www.kemlu.go.id	KEMLU RI @Portal_Kemlu_RI	Kementerian Luar Negeri/@Kemlu.RI	kemlu_ri	Kemlu TV
Followers/Likes	-	91.672	34.681	2.094	-
Tweets	-	21.463	-	-	-
Following	-	203	-	10	-
Upload	-	-	-	-	32

Sources: Data collected by the author from various sources of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia's website, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and YouTube on April 20, 2017.

Use of internet and social media by the ministry was subsequently followed by its embassies. Most of them now have email addresses and Facebook accounts. Ambassadors have also taken to Twitter.

Furthermore, the ministry has also strengthened its presence in digital diplomacy. It improved institutional structure by forming a special unit for digital diplomacy, the Directorate of Information and Media, under the Directorate General of Information and Public Diplomacy. It also enhanced communication and information infrastructure by connecting all 132 representative offices in across 96 countries to Jakarta, thus improving coordination. In addition, in 2017, the ministry also put up a Digital Comment Center, which enables video conferencing with as much as 10 representative offices at once (Sudarma 2017). It also developed human resources capacity building by holding seminars on digital diplomacy every year since 2015.[1]

The problem however is that Indonesia still needs to improve its performance, as far as social media followers and users, format, and substance are concerned. Its Twitter and Facebook followers only number to 93,766 in April 2017, a far cry from the US State Department's. The ministry has also opted for the more traditional social media formats and usage. It needs to optimize and innovate its digital diplomacy programs and initiatives, may look, for instance at the US's platforms such as DipNote, Digital Outreach Team, Opinion Space, Democracy Dialogues and Civil Society 2.10. In DipNote blog, the State Department provides regular updates on new initiatives, including how the US uses open data and collaborative mapping to enhance diplomacy.

Digital content from the ministry is also substantially limited. Searches on the Twitter and Facebook between April 18 to March 29, 2017, yield 44 news articles, mainly self-promotion by the

---

[1] Some of these include the Senior Diplomats Training (Foreign Affairs and Staffing School-Sesparlu) on the new variance of diplomacy (September 29, 2015); "Eco-Tourism: Globalizing Local Communities Without Impacting the Environment" (September 28-29, 2016) in Jakarta (Yahya 2016) where steps to promote tourism in other countries through social media were discussed; and "Digital Diplomacy on Fintech: Opportunity in Disruptivity" (March 29-30, 2017).

ministry and its diplomats. Most accounts feature international engagements (diplomatic visits and international meetings), cooperation agreements, and information related to the ministry (trainings, awards, and seminars). Indonesia's response to various international issues is also limited to a few tweets and Facebook updates. Searches also yielded only only seven international issues engaged by the ministry through Twitter and Facebook, among them, terrorism; the abolition of nuclear weapons; climate change; the European Parliamentary resolution on palm oil; the code of conduct in the South China Sea; and the right to health.

These are important, but the ministry must go beyond its marketing function to achieve diplomacy. Daniele Cave claims that communicating is not the same as influencing. Digital diplomacy is far more than diplomats communicating via social media (Cave 2015). Digital diplomacy in Indonesia must represent a shift in form and in strategy—a way to amplify traditional diplomatic efforts, develop technology-based policy solutions, and encourage cyber activism.

The ministry's digital diplomacy has subsequently attracted criticism. Tantowi Yahya, member of the Indonesian parliament, says that though the ministry has already adopted digital diplomacy, its perspective is still "business as usual," engaging with a "normal" foreign policy background. Human resource and infrastructure prepared to create and shape opinions are yet to be seen (Yahya 2016). Digital diplomacy must go beyond self-promotion, and as McClory states, must rally people for a cause (Munro 2016).

It is time for the Indonesian Government to seriously invest in digital diplomacy capabilities as the world begins to confront more complex challenges, like cyberwar, hacking, and paralyzing data systems (Falahuddin 2015).

Indonesia found itself once in a cyber war of sorts with Australia, Malaysia, and Singapore. The discovery of Australia's wiretapping of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and his close circle erupted into a crisis in 2013. This was not taken sitting down by Indonesians, and as the president tweeted his responses using his personal @SBYudhoyono account (Raeburn 2013), a group called

Anonymous Indonesia launched a counterattack and through Twitter account @anon_indonesia announced that it hacked hundreds of Australian sites, under the code war#OpAustralia (Operation Australia) (Maulana 2013).

Indonesia and Singapore are also frequently involved in cyberwar, especially triggered by the annual forest fires in Sumatra and Kalimantan. High-level government officials often find themselves in a wordwar through social media. At one time, Singapore Foreign Minister K. Shanmugam took the haze issue to his Facebook to question Indonesia's "complete disregard for our people, and their own, and without any embarrassment, or sense of responsibility" (Rashith 2015).

<Fig. 4> The Singaporean Foreign Minister's Facebook on Indonesian Haze.

Source: Rahimah Rashith, "Singapore's Ministers Are Using Facebook To Slam Indonesia For Haze," Sep. 27, 2015, https://mustsharenews.com/sg -ministers- fb-haze/, (Accessed March 15, 2017).

Indonesian Vice-President Jusuf Kalla responded with no remorse. In September 2015, in a dialogue with Indonesians in the Indonesian Consulate in New York, he asked neighboring countries to stop complaining:

> Look at how long they have enjoyed fresh air from our green environment and forests when there were no fires. Could be months. Are they grateful? But when forest fires occur, a month at the most, haze pollutes their regions. So why should there be an apology? (*The Strait Times* 25/09/2015).

Indonesia also continues to confront the onslaught of virtual campaigns by Papuan Free Movement. Current President Joko Widodo (Jokowi) has demonstrated his seriousness to build Papua as may be seen in his three visits to the region since 2014, as well as the accelerated construction of infrastructure in the region. The efforts seem to be ignored by the movement, which relentlessly launched global digital campaigns to influence international opinions and expose human rights violations (Wuryandari 2014). This campaign strategy has somewhat gained its success (Yahya 2016). In the 20th Annual Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) Conference held in Honiara on June 24-26, 2015, the United Liberation Movement for West Papua (ULMWP) was accepted as an observer, while Indonesia a member country (Batlolone and Manulang et.al 2015). Some consider this a defeat of Indonesian diplomacy in the matter of Papua.[2] This is further hammered down by the statement of the delegates from the Pacific Island Countries (Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Tuvalu and Tonga) to the General Assembly of the United Nations in September 2016, urging for Papauan self-determination (Kompas.com 28/09/2016).

In the context of digital diplomacy, Indonesia needs to make a serious structuring effort. Digital diplomacy must not look at platforms as merely instruments to deliver news, but also utilize

---

[2] This statement is claimed by Amiruddin Al-Alrahab (Papua Resource Center). See Vidi Batlolone and James Manullang et.al, "Indonesia Kalah Diplomasi Soal Papua", Sinar Harapan, 29 Juni 2015, http://sinarharapan.co/news/read/150629071/indonesia-kalah-diplomasi-soal-papua. (Accessed April 21, 2017).

them to shape opinions, particularly in times of crisis. In an increasingly interconnected world, the global strategic environment can pose a threat to domestic life; domestic life may affect the international sphere. This condition is increasingly complex as information is freely disseminated and circulated. It is time for the government to take advantage of digital diplomacy that not merely focuses on the impact of international dynamics, but also manages the said impact for the interest of the nation. On the Papuan issue, the Indonesian government may relentlessly launch counter-diplomacy efforts through the internet and social media, explaining problems and holding the fort.

Digital diplomacy is no longer an option but a necessity for Indonesia's national interests. Indonesia needs to develop a more structured digital diplomacy strategy, a synergy among the government, non-governmental associations, the private sector, and academia, that enhances foreign policy and promote collaboration (Sudarma 2017). Social media, if employed appropriately and strategically, will become a force multiplier for the entrenched digital diplomacy campaign of Indonesia.

In order to become the world's most wide-ranging and proactive digital diplomacy in the future, the Indonesian government also needs to invest for the long-term success of infrastructure in digital diplomacy, most especially in the development of human skills and the technological capacities. There is a need to establish a dedicated team of "public communicators" responsible in defining accurately and attractively agenda contents in digital diplomacy. This must be done, since according to Roland Paris, "users of social media who do not engage in substantive, real-time exchanges are unlikely to make their voices heard" (Paris 2013:10).

However, there are always risks with internet and social media usage, as far as transparency, speed, and transformation sharing are concerned. Technology use may not be in line with traditional diplomatic culture, which values privacy. However, traditional, person-to-person diplomacy will remain as important as ever, as nothing can substitute it. The biggest risk of all if it is not engaging in this mass information age, because global diplomacy has gone

digital. As Matt Amstrong says "(in) the age of mass information and precision-guided-media, ignoring social media is surrendering the high ground in the enduring battle of influence minds around the world" (Gong n.d).

Ⅳ. Conclusion

The growing use of ICTs and social media platforms have influenced our way of life, including international diplomacy. The world is becoming smaller, while diplomats need to act more quickly. Although Indonesia has gradually realized the importance of digital diplomacy and recently put it into practice, it is still lagging behind in terms of user engagement, format, and substance. This should be addressed by the Indonesian government.

Looking into the future, the importance of social media will continuously grow, and Indonesia needs to confront problems in coordination among stakeholders. If Indonesia finally taps the full potential of social media, the inherent challenges will be addressed. A more structured digital diplomacy policy that steers clear of these challenges through a synergy among stakeholders can be a viable path to the future.

References

Archetti, Cristina. 2010. Media Impact on Diplomatic Practice: An Evolutionary Model of Change. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association (APSA) Annual Convention, Washington, D.C. on 2-5 September 2010.

Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia (APJII). 2016, Oktober. *Survey Internet*. http://www.apjii.or.id/survei. (Accessed March 11, 2017).

Batlolone, Vidi, and James Manulang et.al. 2015. Indonesia Kalah Diplomasi soal Papua. http://sinarharapan.co/news/read/150629071/indonesia-kalah-diplomasi-soal-papua. (Accessed April 21, 2017).

Borger, Julian and Rankin, Jennifer et al. 2016. The rise and rise of

international diplomacy by WhatsApp. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/nov/04/why-do-diplomats-use-this-alien-whatsapp-emoji-for-vladimir-putin. (Accessed December 28, 2016).

Cave, Danielle. 2015. Does Australia Do Digital Diplomacy? https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/does-australia-do-digital-diplomacy. (Accessed April 10, 2017).

_____. 2016. Digital Diplomacy Links: The Spy who "liked" me, cyber influencing, ISIS, Indonesia and More. Sydney: Lowy Institute. https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/digital-diplomacy-links-spy-who-liked-me-cyber-influencing-isis-indonesia-and-more. (Accessed Feb. 10, 2017).

Digital Diplomacy Rating. 2016. http://digital.diplomacy.live. (Accessed April 10, 2017).

Elliot, Hugh. 2017. Digital Diplomacy: are we the champions? https://blogs.fco.gov.uk/guestpost/2017/03/30/digital-diplomacy-are-we-the-champions/. (Accessed April 18, 2017).

Envoy Center for Digital Diplomacy. 2014. What is digital diplomacy. https://envoycentre.worldpress.com. (Accessed March 23, 2017).

Falahuddin, Mochamad James. 2015. Sekilas Tentang Cyber Crime, Cyber Security dan Cyber War. https://inet.detik.com/security/d-3005339/sekilas-tentang-cyber-crime-cyber-security-dan-cyber-war. (Accessed April 22, 2017).

Foreign & Commonwealth Office (n.d). Social Media Use. https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/foreign-commonwealth-office/about/social-media-use. (Accessed April 18, 2017).

Global Diplomatic Forum (n.d). Digital Diplomacy. http://www.Gdforum.Org/Digital-Diplomacy. (Accessed March 31, 2017).

Gong, Chen Zhuo (n.d). Social media and China's Public Diplomacy: A Path to the Future. Fudan University. https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/e6161fb6-420e-437c-9e8c-e4868d5b66c6.pdf. (Accessed February 3, 2017).

Hanson, Fergus. 2012. Baked In and Wired: eDiplomacy@State, Brookings Instititute Foreign Policy Papers Series (30). http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2012/10/25-ediplomacy-hanson. (Accessed February 2, 2017).

Hidayat, Mochamad Wahyu. 2016. Pengguna Internet di Indonesia

Tembus 132,7 Juta. http://tekno.liputan6.com/read/2633898/
pengguna-internet-di-indonesia-tembus-1327-juta.
(Accessed April 17, 2017).

Internet World Stats. n.d. Top 20 Countries in Internet Users vs All
the World-March 31, 2017. http://www.internetworldstats.
com/top.20.htm (Accessed 17 April 2017).

Jiang, Xiaoying. 2013. US Internet Diplomacy on China. Master
Thesis in China and International Relations, Aalborg
University and University of International Relations.

Johnson, Nikki. 2016. The Top 15 Most Popular Social-Media Sites
in 2016 [Infographic]. https://plugingroup.com/top-15-
popular-social-media-sites november-2016. November 7,
2016 (Accessed April 17, 2017).

Kementerian Luar Negeri. n.d. https://twitter.com/Portal_Kemlu_RI
(Accessed April 20, 2017).

Kompas.com. 2016, September 28. Diserang soal Papua di PBB,
Diplomat Muda Indonesia Balas Para Pemimpin Negara
Pasifik. http://internasional.kompas.com/rea/2016/09/28/21331181/
diserang.soal.papua.di.pbb.diplomat.muda.balas.para.pemim
pin.negara.pasifik. (Accessed April 20, 2017).

Maulana,Adhi. 2013. 4 Fakta Perang Cyber Hacker Indonesia Vs
Australia. http://tekno.liputan6.com/read/751600/4-fakta-
perang-cyber-hacker-indonesia-vs-australia. (Accessed February
16, 2017)

Martin, Clifton and Jagla, Laura. 2013. Integrating Diplomacy and
Social Media. *A Report of The First Annual Aspen Institute
Dialogue on Diplomacy and Technology*. Washington D.C:
The Aspen Institute.

Melissen, Jan. 2005. The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in
International Relations. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Munro, Kelsey. 2016. Australia's digital diplomacy in the age of the
political selfie. *The Age*.

Paris, Ronald. 2013. *The Digital Diplomacy Revolution: Why is
Canada Lagging Behind?* Calgary: Canadian Defense &
Foreign Affairs Institute.

Raeburn, Steven. 2013. Foreign policy meets social Media: Indonesia
spy row ushers in digital diplomacy. http://www.thedrum.com/
opinion/2013/11/25/foreign-policy-meets-social-media-indo

nesia-spy-row-ushers-digital-diplomacy. (Accessed March 15, 2017).

Rashith, Rahimah. 2015. Singapore's Ministers Are Using Facebook To Slam Indonesia For Haze. https://mustsharenews.com/sg-ministers-fb-haze/. (Accessed March 15, 2017).

Rawnsley, Gary D. 1996. *Radio Diplomacy and Propaganda The BBC and VOA in International Politics, 1956‐64*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ross, Alec. 2011. Digital Diplomacy and US Foreign Policy. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* (6).

Santana, Diana. n.d. Diplomacy Beyond the Diplomats. State of Digital Diplomacy 2016. http://www.sodd16.com/digital-diplomacy-beyond-the-diplomat-diana-santana/. (Accessed April 15, 2017).

Sudarma, Siti Sofia (Director of Information and Media, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia). Interview on April 11, 2017, Jakarta.

Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affair. 2008. *ABC of Diplomacy*. Bern: Federal Department of Foreign Affairs.

The Straits Time. 2015. Indonesia VP Kalla reiterates that Indonesia does not need to apologise to neighbours over haze. http://www.straitstimes.com/asia/se-asia/indonesia-vp-kalla-reiterates-that-indonesia-does-not-need-to-apologise-to-neighbours. (Accessed April 22, 2017).

Toffler, Alvin. 1989. *The Third Wave*. New York: Bantam Books.

Workshop Pengelolaan Media Digital: Melatih SDM Kemlu Melaksanakan Diplomasi Digital, on March 18, 2016. http://www.kemlu.go.id/id/berita/Pages/workshop-digital-bandung.aspx. (Accessed March 15, 2017).

Wuryandari, Ganewati. 2014. *A Case of Forget and Forgive? Human Rights in Australian Foreign Policy in east Timor and Papua*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Yahya, Tantowi. 2016. Digital Diplomacy: Sebuah Kebutuhan Yang Mendesak. http://news.detik.com/kolom/d-3194614/digital-diplomasi-sebuah-kebutuhan-mendesak. (Accessed Feb. 5, 2017)