

Hard and Soft Border Paradigm for Border Governance in Indonesia: A General Review

Nadlirotul Ulfa Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Desiana Rizka Fimmastuti Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Anisa Nur Nia Rahmah Kocaeli University, Turkey

Abstract

This study focuses on border governance paradigm for various relevant policies in Indonesia. By applying literature review method, it reveals that Indonesian border governance paradigm has shifted from hard to soft border paradigm. The change has significant impact on how managing border areas in the country. In fact, both paradigms have their own advantages and limitations. This study also shows that the preference between hard or soft boarder paradigm influences the decisions on how the government understand the complexity of the border.

Keywords:

Border Governance; Border Paradigm; Border Policy; Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

This article will see how border governance paradigm in Indonesia works, which are hard border paradigm and soft border paradigm. Both paradigms have

implications towards country's choice of solution in solving problems in the border area.

Border areas often comes with many kinds of problems such as poverty, isolation, gap of social and economy, cross border crime issues (smuggling and illegal trade). Another important issue is the social border which is often not concurrent. The political separation between countries is not necessarily accurate in sorting the national or ethnic identity configuration. So that, problem arises concerning kinship, ethnic, and tribe relationship separated to become two different countries.

Borders historically are produced and reproduced by knowledge domination

Nadlirotul Ulfa currently is a personal assistant of Nur Azizah S.IP., M.Sc in Department of Politics and Government, Universitas Gadjah Mada. Her research interest is in border governance, decentralization and local autonomy. E-mail: nadlirotululfa@gmail.com.

Desiana Rizka Fimmastuti currently active as a research assistant at Research Centre for Politics and Government (PolGov) Department of Politics and Government Fisipol Universitas Gadjah Mada.. Her thesis research has focused on youth in independent political movement and its implication on youth political resilience. E-mail: desiana.rizka.f@mail.ugm.ac.id; desianarf1504@gmail.com

Anisa Nur Nia Rahmah born in Semarang in October 25, 1994. She finished her undergraduate program from Department of Politics and Government Fisipol Universitas Gadjah Mada in 2016. Now she is studying master at Kocaeli University, Turkey. E-mail: anisanurniarahmah@gmail.com and anisa.nur.n@mail.ugm.ac.id

We would like to thank to Department of Politics and Government and Polgov Research Center Universitas Gadjah Mada for their academic support for this research.

from state regime as the manifestation of state sovereignty. State's position in defining problems, threats, and choice of solution is based on a paradigm that later on explains how countries manage their borders. A paradigm shows what and how borders discourse is produced. Borders management is important as it is related to state governability.

State domination in borders governance embodied in hard border paradigm, in which borders are managed by putting safety and sovereignty forward through military representation (Tapiheru in Sanak, 2012). This paradigm makes the state as the actor in charge of the border "space".

Border governance paradigm has an effect on the solutions for the government to choose when a problem occurs. Tagliacozzo (2001) for instance holds that the state is considered as important actor to eradicate illegal activities of goods and services smuggling in South East Asia by optimizing military role. Meanwhile, the study of Elienberg (2008) shows the change of border areas in West Kalimantan, become palm plantation, aims to minimize cross borders activities. This is done to guarantee local security and to control the people activities.

On its development, hard border paradigm seems lack of sensitivity towards plurality of the actors and space in border areas. For examples in Elienberg (2008) study, central government policy through palm oil in fact put local people aside. The security logic contradicts the local people logic who often do cross border activities based on kinship bond.

Those dilemmas are considered as the base of the arise of soft border paradigm, which more accomodates plurality of the actors as well as changes the definition of threats and its solutions. This paradigm starts from two main arguments, which are the accomodation of transnational rights for people, and the border area is flexible, accomodating, and always negotiable (Mostov, 2008). State security is indeed important but it is not enough to guarantee human people security (Chatfield et.al., 2015). This paradigm is considered to be able to accomodate people and market needs more. Other than that, the arise of soft border paradigm is also encouraged by globalization which increases cross border activities. "Border" is getting more permeable towards the move of people, goods, capital, information, and technology. Thus, the threats for the state

are getting more various with the wider scope.

Both hard border paradigm and soft border paradigm have already become choices of the state in governing border area. State choice of paradigm in governing border area has implication on policy outcome itself. Global context together with geo-politics consideration become a part of variables for the government to carefully consider in governing border area.

This study aims to understand how border governance is executed by Indonesia. We will see the way how hard border paradigm and soft border paradigm work in border areas both on the land and in the sea. The search for border governance information becomes very interesting considering the geographical position and the social context of the people that is so plural in border areas. We personally see that the implementation of a paradigm depends on how state regime frames the values and the rules, defines threat for the state, and policy decision based on social-economy context in the border area.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Research Method

This research uses literature study method to disclose and to understand how border governance paradigm in Indonesia works. Literatures from books, journal, unpublished reports, articles from the internet, and related mass media news to see how border governance in Indonesia is.

Hard Border and Soft Border Paradigm: Paradigms in Border Governance

In political geography tradition, border is understood as empirical manifestation of politics process (Paasi, 1996; Mostov, 2008). Border is treated as a base to territorialize the political and administration territory. It means that this is a form of spatial strategy used to control individual as well as resources in a social space (Sack, 1986; Massey, 1995; Paasi, 1998). Thus, border is a spatial political entity as sovereignty supporter of the state as well as locus (dis)connectivity inter-states (Lay et. al., 2012). Border becomes state instrument to protect state interest and to control the mobility of its citizen.

As explained above, historically, border is produced and reproduced by regime through knowledge domination. It

also means the manifestation of state sovereignty. This eventually affects how border is governed. Border is governed by prioritizing state security by putting military force forward or also known as hard border paradigm. Hard border paradigm is an approach emerges from Westphalian State concept (see: Okhonmina, 2010). Colonialism politics has already brought European countries to colonialize other parts of the earth with the gold, glory, and gospel missions. Those missions brought them to colonize both territorially and politically in many places. So, they made colonial 'border' between one and another. This could be seen from coordinate line between colonized territory, such as Indonesia by The Netherland and Timor Leste by Portugal.

Colonialization has left ex colonialized land with certain identity in the border area. The independence of colonialized countries has directly emerged the idea of states nation. Renan (1882) and Anderson (2006) show how that logic works in binding individuals to imagine themselves as a member of social formation called nation of a state. This is later continuously constructed and eventually created a state nation identity as well as differentiation with other nation

identity. This point of view has indirectly placed the state as main actor in governing border area.

This paradigm has implication on the importance of sovereignty and security aspect in border area. State has been placed as an actor that has important role in securing border area, which means saving the sovereignty of the country in front of the others. State's formal stance on understanding border has implication on legal and illegal identification. State takes full control on people and resource mobilization in border area. Thus, placing military in border area is a way to secure state area.

In its development, this paradigm is considered to be the cause of problems affecting border areas, such as poverty, isolation, resource constraints, socio-economic disparities with other regions, and dependence on other countries. This is a result when it has marginalized the issue of human development and the region on the border. This inspired the emergence of soft border paradigm, which border governance is to prioritize more on people security (Mostov, 2008). This concept recognizes that state security is important, but is not sufficient to ensure the safety and well-being of people. Therefore, it is considered more important

to meet basic human needs, such as food, habitable housing, education, health, and infrastructure development (Sanak, 2012). That is, it assumes a widening state threat. The state is not only threatened with the of its nation-states identity but is also threatened by its inability to fulfill the rights of its citizens.

This paradigm shift is also influenced by the globalization and reconfiguration of power brought about by the concept of governance and democratization. Hard borders are considered less sensitive to the dimensions of other actors, i.e. communities and markets. This resulted in the neglect of various issues such as the importance of trading zones in economic development, the importance of human security, and connectivity between regions to realize independence. The border area can not be approached only by its formalistic nature, since the border area have always been the space for other entities that have lived before the state is present. The entity has its own image and interests, so the soft border paradigm becomes an alternative that is considered capable of bridging diversity in a space called the border.

Unlike the hard border, soft border paradigm does not put the country as the only actor. This paradigm sees the

diversity of actors as a matter of concern in border governance. This approach is more humanistic, therefore issues such as human security, welfare, and the availability of goods and services become things that must be accommodated. Stephen Okhonmina (2010) in his article entitled States without Borders: Westphalia Territoriality under Threat, explains that the concept of boundary based on the term of agreement will gradually end along while globalization increases. The increasing flow of goods and services will have implications on the increasingly blurred boundaries between one country and another. Mostov (2008) reflects this on the growth of regionalization and various free trade zones in various regions. This arises because of a paradigm that changes the meaning of national boundaries and how they are managed. Soft border paradigm puts actors, other than the state, can also play a role in fulfilling their needs. Through the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC/MEA) for example, people can more easily exchange goods and services between countries in order to obtain maximum economic benefits. The fulfillment of the needs and welfare of the community becomes an argument supported by this paradigm.

Although the two paradigms of border governance appear to have their own unique respective characteristics, however, basically border governance is not a monolithic and absolute one, which allows for a combination between the two. The use of hard border or soft border approach, or a combination of both, is not without consideration in responding to social context. The state as the ultimate authority holder has the right to choose how to solve the boundary problem. One of the considerations is with whom the country is related. This can be observed from various cases in the world, some of which are conducted by the EU, Vietnam and China, as well as the United States.

The similarity of physical, cognitive and cultural economic conditions has led countries in the EU to agree to free human and goods movements throughout the region that agreed on the Schengen Agreement in 1985. The consequence is the existence of a joint policy for short-term entry permits, external extermination and cross-border police cooperation. The hope was that the policy could lead to the development of a more advanced EU.

What happens today in the EU is the result of the idea of what the world wants which is a borderless world in today's globalization era. This idea requires a de-

territorialization and less restrictive territorial system (Wastl-Walter, 2011). This is at least driven by, *firstly* the growth of cross-border activities through the massive and intensive movements of people, goods, and service. *Secondly*, there is a transfer of political power from the central government to the region that affects the territorialization of power. Eventually, it provides subnational the opportunities to participate as the main actors in the discussion of the border. *Third*, the end of cold war makes the attention of the world turned to the issues of economy and prosperity through the efforts of economic integration in global capitalism (Perkmann, 2007). Meanwhile, Scholte (2005) predicted that globalization will improve, *firstly*, on cross-border relations, internationalization of issues and solutions. *Secondly*, open-border relations, where liberalization is increasing in many sectors. *Thirdly*, trans-border relations, in which social relations are detached from the territory.

Slightly different from the EU, ASEAN is also one of the regionalizations in Southeast Asia to respond the increase of transborder activities. ASEAN encourages the friendship regime through the ASEAN Connectivity concept. Even in 2015, ASEAN drafted the ASEAN Community

concept with an integration scheme of political-security, economic, and socio-cultural agenda. Although it appears to weaken the borders between countries, the concept of regionalization like the EU and others may be a re-territorialization process of building new boundaries with other non-regionalized countries.

Furthermore, the management of trade-based border areas also appears on the border between Guangxi Province (China) and Quang Ninh Province (Vietnam). Both countries agreed to work together to develop border areas by building industrial zones to attract investment. The new mechanism is expected to benefit both countries, while building border areas. Currently, Mong Chai Town in Vietnam is the center of commodity trading originating from China, so there are many Chinese traders doing cross-border activities in this city for both trade and travel, and even building infrastructure in the region.

What happens in EU countries and in China-Vietnam shows the state's softening the border regulation. Various countries make themselves equal and make coordination to each other to accommodate the interests of society. The militaristic approach is not very much visible in the border regions of the

country. In fact, the opposite situation happens where the state is present to facilitate the community in carrying out cross-border activities so that it will have implications on the economic growth of the border region.

In contrast to both cases, the United States demonstrates the use of different governance paradigms related to the country to which it borders. The United States has different policies in responding to problems in the border region with Canada to the north and Mexico to the south. The United States government does not present military forces in the border region with Canada. While the border region with Mexico is represented through armed military apparatus and a wall built along the border area.

The border with Mexico is represented by the U.S. Border Patrol which is part of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (US-CBP). The hard border approach is an option because it deals with national security threats, such as ever-increasing illegal immigrants, narcotics and drugs smuggling over time. The hard border regime is exposed to an increase in the number of U.S. Border Patrol officer of 4,000 in 1994, 9,000 in 2000, 15,000 in 2008 and 21,000 personnels in 2010 (Bangun, 2014). An

increase in the number of personnel indicates the US attitude is increasingly alert in the border region with Mexico.

The situation is very much different in the approach taken by the United States in guarding the border with Canada. In addition to demographics, there are many people living in border areas, the two countries seem to have a fairly strong economic dependence on exports and imports. This is evident from the flow of goods across the border around US \$ 1.5 billion per day (Bangun, 2014). To manage the border areas with Canada, the United States specifically has the Northern Border Advisory Task Force tasked with overseeing and providing opinions on the strategic and actual issues occurring in the border areas of the United States and Canada. The task force was formed by the Homeland Security Advisory Council as part of the Department of Homeland Security (Bangun, 2014). The United States government policy on border governance shows that soft border regimes and hard border regimes can run together depending on what country to deal with. There is an influential socio-political context in deciding the stance point in border governance.

CONTEXT: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Problem Complexity in Indonesian Border

Border governance in Indonesia can not be separated from the problems in this region. Various problems cannot be resolved in one way only, because they all have each unique content and context. However, there are at least two common problems encountered in Indonesian borders which are territorial claims and public welfare.

As mentioned earlier, border governance is inseparable to the geographical area. One of the problems arises is that there has been no agreement between borders. In the sea area for example, there are problems in terms of continental shelf and Exclusive Economic Zone (ZEE). Some of the problems on the continental shelf include between Indonesia and Timor Leste in the Ombai Strait, Leti Strait, Timor Sea; and Indonesia with Malaysia in the Singapore Straits and the Celebes Sea. The problems in ZEE include Indonesia with Malaysia in the Malacca Strait, South China Sea (East Malaysia West and East Part, Sarawak Beach), and Sulawesi Sea; and Indonesia-Vietnam in the South China Sea (Nadalutti, 2015).

Territorial dimension becomes an important thing, because it relates to the

sovereignty of a country. Various activities in this area must be in accordance with applicable legal procedures to determine whether an activity is legal or not. This is often followed by a variety of transnational crime issues such as inland areas of smuggling and illegal trade (drug dealing, human trafficking, illegal logging, etc.), where in the sea areas the problem of illegal fishing is on the list to be solved.

The next issue is the welfare. Community welfare is the result of various factors such as economy, health, basic needs, and so on. Differences in the economic conditions of border areas with neighboring countries sometimes trigger the complexity of border problems, such as the Indonesia-Malaysia border case (Djafar et.al., 2016; Eilenberg, 2008). Compared to the conditions of Malaysian society, Indonesians in the border area are far left behind (Druce and Baikoeni, 2016). The level of welfare of the people of Indonesia is still low, such as the level of education, health, economics, limited access, and limited facilities and infrastructure. As a result, Malaysia becomes the migration magnet of the Indonesian population to earn a living. The large number of people on the border such as West Kalimantan and East Kalimantan prefer to work in Sarawak,

even with the status of being illegal labors (Eilenberg, 2014; Sari 2016; Spaan and van Naerssen, 2017). This appears to be a dilemma when there are increasingly demanding demands, but on the other hand there are demands to improve security in border areas.

Based on these problems, then how to solve them? What has been the basis of border management in Indonesia so far? The next section will describe the border governance prevailing approach of the Indonesia's effort in resolving problems in the border area.

The State in Securing Territory and Solving Illegality: Depends on the Definition of Threat

The problem of illegality and unclear borders are some issues which are often discussed in the perspective of defense and conventional security. This happens not only in the land area, but also in the territorial sea of Indonesia (Indrawan, 2016).

In the Indonesian marine territory, the lack of clarity of management in border areas between countries has led to conflict, for example the conflict that occurred in 2016, where China claims that its fishermen are not guilty of fish theft in Natuna waters. This is because

China considers Natuna waters is a traditional fishing zone, so it is legal for them to catch fish. Meanwhile, Indonesia considers the activity is illegal because it is still in the territorial waters of Indonesia.

Cases that occur in the waters of Indonesia is actually a problem that has occurred since long time ago. To overcome those various problems, Indonesia has had a firm attitude in overcoming the perpetrators of illegal fishing, namely by sinking the ship. This is evident from the number of foreign ships captured by the Navy and related ministries. The captured vessel had stolen the fish had a court process before it was decided to be drowned.

At least there are 38 foreign vessels that have been drowned in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) government era (2007-2012) of which 33 came from Vietnam. The number of drownings increased significantly by 236 vessels that had been drowned throughout 2016 (Under the presidency of Joko Widodo and leadership of Susi as the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries from various countries, including China (Wulandari, 2009).

If in-depth analysis is conducted, the implementation of this policy becomes

part of several things, namely political and military security, safety, and including natural resources security owned by Indonesia (Wadley, 2014). The illegal entry of foreign ships into Indonesia is a concrete threat as well as a form of violation of the sovereignty of the state. For this reason, the Government of Indonesia took a firm stance. In addition, these ships also take fishery resources in the territory of Indonesia so it needs to be addressed firmly in order to have a deterrent effect. This directly demonstrates the workings of marine border governance by promoting the hard border paradigm, because of the importance of maintaining sovereignty. Whoever disrupts Indonesia's maritime boundaries, military representation and judicial processes are integral part of those who interfere with Indonesian sovereignty.

The exposure indicates that the guarding of the territorial sea area becomes non-negotiable. Although firm action against illegal fishing has put Thailand's fishery economy down 3.1% and China down 4.5%, Indonesia seems undaunted by any actors behind the violation of the territory (Wuryandari, 2009). This is slightly different from the maintenance of the land area, where it is necessary to be more sensitive towards

different social contexts from one region to another.

In land border areas, military representation is still part of national policy. Checking the completeness of documents and luggage is common in the border area. Common problems include illegal logging, smuggling activities, and shifting border stakes. The military presence in this area is nothing but to maintain the security and sovereignty of the state.

The predominance of hard border paradigm is also recorded on the border management of East Nusa Tenggara and Timor Leste. The management of the border with the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste was recorded during post-reformation, after Timor Leste left Indonesia with its referendum on 30 August 1999. Meanwhile, in managing the border with Timor Leste, Indonesia tends to apply the hard border regime. This happens because there is a series of incidents, dispute on concept of boundary lines, and land conflicts. There are also issues in Timor Leste and Indonesia's bilateral affairs: demarcation, border security, regime issues, refugees, and illegal economic activity. The hard border regime appears from the establishment of two types of security post namely

immigration management or immigration posts, and border posts (Wuryandari, 2009). This immigration management site is guarded by officers from Indonesian military (TNI) and police (POLRI), immigration, customs, and quarantine. This post serves as an entrance to goods and services, as well as passage of people between the two countries, while the border post is guarded by officers from the TNI/POLRI that serves to guard the border areas from illegal activities and maintain the security of the people on the border of Indonesia and Timor Leste.

Hard border paradigm seems to be opted by the Government of Indonesia in response to threats from Timor Leste. Such threats include the internal security conditions of East Timor and the existence of gangs in Timor Leste. The group can turn into a radical movement that tries to exploit all the limitations felt by the people in the border region to fight against the State. This means that what the Government of Indonesia is doing depends on the country in the border region. Timor Leste has also implemented a hard border regime type.

However, there are implications of potential conflict due to the implementation of the hard border regime implemented by Indonesia and Timor

Leste. The shared identities of Timorese people; namely tribe, religion, custom, and even kinship must now be separated due to political decision resulted from the referendum in early 2000s. However, in their daily life, they do not really want the use of documents or conditions that is too strict to get in and out, as happened in the Amfoang - Kupang and Oecussi - Timor Leste areas, where to enter the territory of both countries could only use a letter from the village headman or local government to be submitted to the border post officers without having to use a passport (Wuryandari, 2009). In addition, the community also does not need the security personnel in large numbers and the security is tight because it can lead to the perception that the area is vulnerable and unsafe.

However, in fact there are also problems of underdevelopment, inequality, and economic disparities and poor infrastructure in border areas which are causing the emergence of illegal trade routes along the border line between Indonesia and Timor Leste. Although there have been border security posts, people in both countries are still trying to find a shortcut to meet the needs of life. The most common case is the smuggling of basic commodities from Indonesia to

Timor Leste in a way of East Timorese people contacting their relatives or friends residing in the Indonesian territory to find basic materials to meet the needs in Timor Leste. This is done to avoid strict checks in the border area and also to avoid imposition of the cost of in and out of goods at the border post which causes the price of basic commodities to be more expensive (Wuryandari, 2009). This is the dilemma where the public wants a small number of security personnel and not too tight border security but on the other hand the country also wants to ensure there is no violation of law between the two countries that have the potential to disrupt the sovereignty of a country.

Human Security: Human Development in Border Area

The soft border approach has brought the human security discourse to take precedence. According to Sen (1994), human security has significance that is, *firstly*, security from the threat of hunger, disease, and oppression. *Secondly*, it is a protection from sudden and disruptive disturbance in the pattern of community life. There are seven branches of security in human security namely economic,

food, health, environment, individual, community, and political security.

It seems that the approach of human security has become the reason for the development of the border, by improving the welfare of the people through the fulfillment of the basic rights of the citizens. It starts from the problem of human security about backwardness, inequality and gaps in the border area then the government have tried several attempts to remove the view of the border area as the national backyard. One of them is by building road infrastructure. Based on data obtained from the BNPP (National Border Management Agency) web page, President Jokowi's Government has disbursed Rp2.5 trillion for road construction and repairs in border areas in Kalimantan, Nusa Tenggara, and Papua (bnpp.go.id). In addition, BNPP as an institution authorized to take care of border areas will also improve the economy in the border areas of Indonesia by developing cooperative systems in remote villages. In addition, BNPP has also established priority locations in areas directly adjacent to Timor Leste such as Belu Regency, Rote Ndao District, and Alor Regency (bnpp.go.id). Along with the establishment of priority sites in the border areas, the problems in the area are

immediately resolved such as closing illegal trade lines, improving the border postal facilities, and improving the quality of human resources at the border.

In addition to infrastructure, the government has also implemented an electrification program, namely, the operation of power plants that have reached 50 locations in the border area. The program is implemented in various border areas in Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, East Nusa Tenggara, Maluku and North Maluku, by providing the flow of 100 kW, 200 kW, and 500 kW respectively. Although it is indeed difficult to meet the electricity needs in the border area because of the vastness of areas that are difficult to reach. For example, in border areas with Malaysia, PT PLN must import electricity from Malaysia to illuminate border areas such as Sambas, Bengkayang, Entikong and Kapuas districts because it is more easily accessible from Malaysia. The government has imported 8 MW of electricity to illuminate the 4 districts.

Long before the Jokowi era, the approach of human security by emphasizing the fulfillment of basic needs and economic benefits has been applied in the border areas of Indonesia-Malaysia on the island of Borneo (currently North

Kalimantan). In the Indonesia-Malaysia border region on the island of Borneo, the Sosek Malindo cooperation was established in 1967. Despite the onset of the hard border regime, this cooperation was motivated by the conflict resolution after the confrontation, and the need to meet the needs of the border community. This cooperation is marked by the Border Trade Agreement (BTA), where everyone who domiciled in the border area can trade cross border to meet the necessities of life. Buy and sell transactions can be done with a maximum limit of 600 RM per month (Lay, et al: 2014). Thus, people within the border area can easily meet the needs of life without having to wait for supplies from the government.

While in the border area of Indonesia-Singapore on the island of Sumatra, precisely on the island of Batam, an effective action has been done in border governance for economic considerations and geography. In managing Batam area, the government places it as a front porch in border security politics, as it is on the busiest track in Southeast Asia. Its management as a 'front porch' should be arranged as attractive as possible so that many people would come to Indonesia. Batam has been managed with the logic as Indonesia's front porch since the New

Order government and it continues even up to now. Inside the master plan of 2011-2014 the National Agency for the Management of the Batam Area, it is placed as a prioritized border site to be addressed in the direction of its border development. These areas include Padang, Bulang and Batam. The existence of this mechanism further confirms that Batam is an area that is projected as the front porch of Indonesia.

Since the 1970's Batam has become a leading island for Indonesia to compete with Singapore, to this day it remains the same. The economic policy scheme is considered by the government will be able to solve the welfare problem for Batam in particular. The management of border areas with this scheme have not only been benefiting Batam, but also Indonesia.

As the front line of the border with Singapore, the islands in Batam's administrative unity have increased the strategic value of the empty islands that have no potential to become an area that must be maintained and confirmed the validity of ownership. This has been realized by the Indonesian government in the late 1970s when the Minister of Research and Technology B.J. Habibie succeeded in convincing President

Soeharto to pay attention to the outer islands such as Batam and Bintan to immediately formulate long-term plans for the development and development of the islands. Soeharto then issued a presidential decree in Keppres number 41/1973 which set Batam to become an industrial development area under the Batam Industrial Authority (Batam Authority).

The tasks of Batam Authority are; to develop and control the development of the Batam island as an industrial area and ship transfer activities, to plan the needs of infrastructure and the installation of other facilities, to accommodate the business license application, and to ensure the smoothness and order of licensing procedures in encouraging foreign investment flows in Batam. During the assignment of the Batam Authority in 1979, a master plan was established by the Ministry of Public Works which established four main functions of Batam island, namely as an industrial area, free trade zone, ship transfer, and tourism.

Under the agency, the Batam area continues to grow. In 1977 or four years after the formation of the Batam Authority, Batam then managed to attract investment from foreign investors amounted to 2.145 million US dollars

(Wulandari, 2009). At its peak, in the 1980s, the company's 564 representatives in Batam grew to 2,043 international companies that established their representative offices (Wulandari, 2009).

In its journey, Batam's strategic location in the world's trade route encourages the government to function Batam as a National Strategic Activities Center (Pusat Kegiatan Strategis Nasional/ PKSN). Batam was also projected as a border area designed to rival Singapore in terms of establishing large ports and packing containers. This is due to the fact that as many as 50,000 container ships cross the Strait of Malacca each year and the shipping vessels carry a quarter of the world's marine trade.

In the Reformation era the central government treated Batam in a special way. Batam's strategic position in the trade economy makes it necessary for the government to issue several policies to regulate Batam. The New Order era designed Batam to emulate Singapore, so since then until now Batam needs special treatment. In post-Soeharto era, i.e. reformation era, there are at least two rules/policies that define Batam as a Special Economic Zone (Zona Ekonomi Eksklusif/ ZEE) and as a free trade zone.

The objective of ZEE implementation is as an economic system that is sided with the people through economic welfare, so it is not only the policies that are spawned only for the sake of politics. The economic interests reflected are; the increase of employment investment, foreign exchange earnings through export schemes, increasing the competitive advantage of export production, promoting quality improvement of human resources through technology transfer (Apriliyanti, 2015).

Since the issuance of Government Regulation In Lieu of Law (Perpu). No. 1/2007 which was followed by Law no. 44/2007 on Free Trade Zone (Zona Perdagangan Bebas/ ZPB), there is one article that affirms the management of the free area will be the responsibility of an agency called the Badan Pengusahaan Kawasan Perdagangan dan Pelabuhan Bebas. In line with the issuance of PP no. 46/2007 on Free Trade Zone Batam, then automatically the agency responsible for the management of this area is the Badan Pengusahaan Kawasan Perdagangan dan Pelabuhan Bebas. It states that Batam Island Industrial Development Authority has been changed into Badan Pengusahaan Kawasan Batam.

Law no. 44/ 2007 about FTZ is one of the legitimacy form for Batam island to continue as an international standard industry area. Batam is set by Indonesian government to be a stepping stone to play in the international trade arena. The increasingly strong globalization drives have forced Indonesia to 'take care of' Batam. Strategic trading location makes Batam as a door to export primarily with free market momentum.

Releasing Isolation through Connectivity

Another issue at the border is isolation. The difficulty of access of people on the border with other regions in Indonesia triggered, for example, Indonesian people in the Kalimantan-Sarawak border prefer Malaysia to fulfill their needs (Sinkovics et. al., 2015). Malaysia's more advanced development conditions with more complete facilities and infrastructure, such as road access, schools, markets, and hospitals, make the Indonesians prefer Sarawak rather than having to go to Pontianak which is much farther away at once at a greater cost. Hundreds of traders from Indonesia choose to sell in the Sarawak market rather than Pontianak, thus contributing more to the Malaysian economy (Sari, 2016).

This is what underlies the importance of inter-regional connectivity, especially in border areas. The effort undertaken in the era to open the isolation of the border area is by the construction of road parallel and sea tolls. This border parallel road will span 2,101 km in Indonesia - Malaysia, 820 km in Indonesia–Papua New Guinea and 300 km in Indonesia–Timor Leste.

One of the interesting features in President Joko Widodo era is the commitment to strengthen national identity as a maritime country. In this case the sea toll becomes one of his agenda. As it is known that Indonesia is an archipelagic state connected by a vast ocean. Nevertheless, one of the problems faced by the outermost community is the availability of basic needs of society. Considerable amount of Indonesian border communities depends on other countries, especially to meet their daily needs. Internationally, Indonesia's connectivity index rating in the marine transportation sector in 2014 increased to 77 compared to 2012 which only ranked 104 (ADB, 2016). The rating is still far below Malaysia and Thailand which have better connectivity rates. If the built connectivity can be achieved, then the

next expectation is the emergence of new economic growth centers in the regions.

The lack of ports and other means of infrastructure ultimately impacts on the life of border communities because people have difficulties to access various basic needs to support their lives. If the problem is not responded quickly by the government, of course, it will bring an impact on the emergence of significant economic gap (Cribb and Ford, 2009).

To ensure the delivery of goods in various areas, President Joko Widodo made a toll road policy to ensure connectivity between regions in Indonesia. The sea toll design is built from the west side to the east of Indonesia and will go through the seven main ports in Indonesia. Not only that, the government will also build 47 non-commercial ports (finance.detik.com, 2016). The sea toll presupposes the inter-island connectivity through the sea so that the distribution of various resources can be done efficiently. This policy is expected to facilitate the flow of goods and capital flows in various regions in Indonesia. The availability of this transportation can strengthen investors' commitment to invest in Indonesia.

Based on the above explanation, it is evident that connectivity becomes

important to ensure human security and encourage investment. Sea toll mechanism has been able to penetrate the community in the sea border area so that later they will get a positive impact. In terms of border governance, this policy is part of the soft border paradigm. The majority of these areas are in the border areas of Indonesia with other countries within the framework of the sea border. Sea toll becomes part that is capable of realizing effective marine connectivity because of the ships that sail regularly and have fixed schedule from west to east, and vice versa, of the archipelago. To sustain this vision, there are various aspects that support the sea toll program such as adequate ports, inland adequate access, adequacy of cargo from west to east and from east to west, shipping industry, and regular and scheduled shipping. The condition is important to realize Indonesia as a maritime axis of the world in 2045.

The hope is, border areas which are covered by the sea toll route will be more advanced with the support of infrastructure and fulfillment of basic needs of society. Things that become problems in the border area, namely connectivity and the availability of basic needs of society which can be resolved

when the sea toll road design can run well. The improvement of this border region can attract the attention of various parties to invest their capital so that this region can grow better.

It is observable that President Joko Widodo's two policies on the marine sector have different shades at one time. Drowning of fish thief ships became part of the hard border paradigm because of the context of issues pertaining to sovereignty. The sinking of those ships is a manifestation of firm stance for anyone who has stolen fishery resources in the Indonesian seas, and has directly threatened sovereignty. On the other hand, the toll road policy describes the soft border paradigm used by the government to ensure inter-regional connectivity, especially the areas adjacent to the sea. In this way, Indonesia's foremost region can grow and eventually have a better bargaining position. Both policies have different contexts, so the paradigm used by the government also has differences. Basically, the use of paradigm will be closely related to the context of what problems are being faced.

CONCLUSION

As it is known that every regime that leads certainly has its own style and

priorities. This is evident in the paradigm that underlies various border governance policies in Indonesia. Although in the past the issue of border has been getting attention, but at the time of Joko Widodo this issue began to get its spark. Operationalization of power plants; making habitable house; development of road parallel roads on the border between Indonesia-Malaysia and Indonesia-Papua New Guinea; and sea toll road development are programs to address the development of the region, and people that have previously been seemingly marginalized. This shows sample of soft border paradigm that is beginning to appear in border governance - and on the other hand the hard border regime is also applied in overcoming other problems, for example about borders and against illegality (Missbach, 2014; Nethery and Gordyn, 2014). However, the application of this hard border paradigm has negative implications on the supply of fish in other countries.

Soft border paradigm put human security (human security) is preferred based on the fulfillment of basic rights of citizens. During this time, the focus of border governance is dominated by hard border paradigm, which holds the view that state security becomes important in

the border area. This is ultimately considered to be the cause of poverty, socio-economic disparities, and the isolation of community access in border areas. Therefore, the need to see the border not only as a place to maintain the security of the country with a militaristic approach, but towards how to manage the border by interconnecting security with the needs of people living in the border area.

Both paradigms, soft borders and hard borders, both emphasize the concept of state sovereignty but with different approaches. The border is essentially a political entity to affirm state sovereignty by protecting the interests of the state and simultaneously controlling connectivity between countries. The state's sovereignty for the hard border paradigm lies in the protection of threats from outside the country by emphasizing the country's territorial survival. Meanwhile, the soft border paradigm realizes sovereignty by protecting its citizens through the fulfillment of basic human needs, such as food, habitable housing, education, health, and infrastructure development by not closing opportunities for cooperation between countries.

Both of these approaches actually work simultaneously. However, which

approach predominates depends on the state's first consideration, the state regime that frames values and rules, how it will act on its neighbors. Second, how the state defines the threat of the state. Third, what is the socio-economic context in the border area? The accuracy of policy making based on the characteristics of the region will encourage the development of the region in question while avoiding counterproductive policies.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflection of the Emergence and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso
- Apriliyanti, Romayanti. (2015). Upaya Diplomasi Indonesia Pada Peningkatan Investasi Asing di Kota Batam. *Jurnal FISIP, (2)1*.
- Asian Development Bank. (2016). *Indonesia's Summary Transport Assesment*, ADB: Manila.
- Bangun, B H. (2014). *Membangun Model Kerjasama Pengelolaan Perbatasan Negara Di Kalimantan Barat-Sarawak (Suatu Studi Perbandingan)*, *MMH, (43)1*.
- Batam Sejak 1968 Hingga Era Otonomi Daerah. (2014). Kementrian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat.
- BNPP (Badan Nasional Pengelolaan Perbatasan) Republik Indonesia. (2011) Rencana Induk Pengelolaan Batas Wilayah Negara dan Kawasan Perbatasan tahun 2011-2014.
- BP Batam. (2008) *Sejarah BP Batam* (Diakses dari http://www.bpbatam.go.id/ini/aboutBida/bida_history.jsp tanggal 8 Maret 2014)
- Chatfield, A. T., Reddick, C. G., & Brajawidagda, U. (2015). Government surveillance disclosures, bilateral trust and Indonesia–Australia cross-border security cooperation: Social network analysis of Twitter data. *Government Information Quarterly, 32(2)*, 118-128.
- Cribb, R. B., & Ford, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Indonesia beyond the water's edge: managing an archipelagic state*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Djafar, F., Hassan, M. K. H., & Husaini, D. H. (2016). Informal agricultural trade and trans-border farmers between Malaysia and Indonesia.

- The Journal of Developing Areas, 50(4), 19-37.
- Druce, S. C., & Baikoeni, E. Y. (2016). Circumventing Conflict: The Indonesia–Malaysia Ambalat Block Dispute. In *Contemporary Conflicts in Southeast Asia* (pp. 137-156). Springer Singapore.
- Eilenberg, M. (2008). Claiming authority at the edges of the state: regional autonomy and local politics in the West Kalimantan Borderlands. Department of Indonesian Studies, University of Sydney.
- Eilenberg, M. (2014). Frontier constellations: Agrarian expansion and sovereignty on the Indonesian-Malaysian border. *Journal of peasant studies*, 41(2), 157-182.
- <https://finance.detik.com/berita-ekonomi-bisnis/3127301/jonan-kami-telah-kembangkan-329-pelabuhan-dan-siapkan-3-trayek-tol-laut>
- Indrawan, I. A. (2016). Ship Arrest in Indonesia and Cross-Border Maritime Dispute. *Indonesian J. Int'l L.*, 14, 456.
- Sari, W. K. (2016, January). RE-UNDERSTANDING BORDER AREA AS THE COMMON SPACE FOR INTRA STATES. In *International Conference on Social Politics*.
- Lay, Cornelis, et al. (2014). *Rethinking the Border: In Search of Border Governance Concept*. Yogyakarta: FISIPOL UGM
- Massey, D. (1995). 'The Conceptualization of Place', in D. Massey and P. Jess (eds). *A Place in the World*. Oxford: The Open University.
- Missbach, A. (2014). Doors and fences: Controlling Indonesia's porous borders and policing asylum seekers. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 35(2), 228-244.
- Mostov, Julie. (2008). *Soft Borders: Rethinking Sovereignty & Democracy*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Nadalutti, E. (2015). The rise of trans-border regions in Southeast Asia: behind the dynamics of informal and formal integration processes in the 'Indonesia–Malaysia–Singapore' growth triangle. *The Pacific Review*, 28(4), 607-630.
- Nethery, A., & Gordyn, C. (2014). Australia–Indonesia cooperation on asylum-seekers: a case of 'incentivised policy transfer'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 68(2), 177-193.

- Okhonmina, S. (2010) 'States Without Borders: Westphalia Territoriality under Threat' dalam *Journal Social Science*. Vol. 24, No. 3, hal. 177-182
- Paasi, Anssi. (1996). 'Inclusion, Exclusion and Territorial Identities: The Meanings of Boundaries in the Globalizing Geopolitical Landscape'. *Nordisk Samhallsgeografisk Tidskrift*. 23, pp. 6-23.
- Paasi, Anssi. (1998). 'Boundaries as Social Processes: Territoriality in the World Flows'. *Geopolitics Journal*. Vol. 3, No. 1. pp. 69-88.
- Perkmann, M. (2007). Construction of new territorial scales: a framework and case study of the EUREGIO cross-border region. *Regional studies*, 41(2), 253-266.
- Renan, E. (1882, March 11). What is a Nation. Retrieved March 11, 2016, from *Humanity in Action*: <http://www.humanityinaction.org/files/569-E.Renan-WhatisaNation.pdf>
- Sack, R. D. (1998). *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanak, Y. (2012). *Human Security dan Politik Perbatasan*. Yogyakarta: POLGOV-JPP UGM.
- Scholte, J. A. (2005). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sen, A. (1994). *Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement*.
- Spaan, E., & van Naerssen, T. (2017). Migration decision-making and migration industry in the Indonesia–Malaysia corridor. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-16.
- Sinkovics, R. R., Sinkovics, N., Lew, Y. K., Jedin, M. H., & Zagelmeyer, S. (2015). Antecedents of marketing integration in cross-border mergers and acquisitions: Evidence from Malaysia and Indonesia. *International Marketing Review*, 32(1), 2-28.
- Tagliacozzo, E. (2001). 'Border Permeability and the State in Southeast Asia' dalam *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. Vol. 23, No. 2, hal. 254-27.
- Wulandari, T. dkk., (2009), *Sejarah Wilayah Perbatasan Batam-Singapura 1842-2009; Satu Selat*

Dua Nakhoda, Depok: Gramata
Publishing, hal. 104

Wadley, R. L. (2014). *Border Studies
Beyond Indonesia: A Comparative
Perspective*. Antropologi Indonesia

Wastl-Walter, D. (Ed.). (2011). *The
Ashgate research companion to
border studies*. Ashgate Publishing,
Ltd.

Wuryandari, Ganewati dkk. (2009).
*Keamanan di Perbatasan
Indonesia-Timor Leste*. Yogyakarta:
Pustaka Pelajar.