

## INDONESIA IN THE GLOBALIZATION TRAP: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

**Singgih Tri Sulistiyono**

Department of History, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University

---

### ABSTRACT

By using historical approach, this article intends to examine the problems faced by Indonesia as a developing country in connection to the strengthening process of globalization. The rapid process of globalization has been responded aggressively by Indonesia without considering internal readiness. Since the New Order period, Indonesia has been very eager to appear as a modern nation by coping with the demand of globalization and economic liberalization as has been campaigning by the developed countries. Indonesia has responded excessively to liberalization through the jargon of globalization and regionalization. That is, Indonesia is very open to free competition with the outside world while the internal condition has not been well prepared. Internal conditions include the bureaucracy and other institutions as well as the quality of human resources. Since the New Order government, dozens of bilateral, multilateral, and international agreements have been signed by the Indonesian government for performing economic liberalization in the field of investment, trade, and labor which in turn causing what the so called 'globalization trap'.

Keywords: globalization trap, colonization, regional architecture, liberalization, national interest

### ABSTRAK

Dengan menggunakan pendekatan historis, artikel ini bermaksud untuk meneliti masalah yang dihadapi oleh Indonesia sebagai negara berkembang sehubungan dengan proses penguatan globalisasi. Proses cepat globalisasi telah direspon agresif oleh Indonesia tanpa mempertimbangkan kesiapan internal. Sejak masa Orde Baru, Indonesia sudah sangat bersemangat untuk tampil sebagai bangsa modern dengan mengatasi permintaan globalisasi dan liberalisasi ekonomi seperti telah berkampanye oleh negara-negara maju. Indonesia telah menanggapi secara berlebihan liberalisasi melalui jargon globalisasi dan regionalisasi. Artinya, Indonesia sangat terbuka untuk persaingan bebas dengan dunia luar sementara kondisi internal belum siap. Kondisi internal meliputi birokrasi dan lembaga lainnya serta kualitas sumber daya manusia. Sejak pemerintah Orde Baru, puluhan perjanjian bilateral, multilateral, dan internasional telah ditandatangani oleh pemerintah Indonesia untuk melakukan liberalisasi ekonomi di bidang investasi, perdagangan, dan tenaga kerja yang pada gilirannya menyebabkan apa yang disebut 'globalisasi perangkap'.

Kata kunci: perangkap globalisasi penjajahan, arsitektur regional, liberalisasi, kepentingan nasional

## INTRODUCTION

The main objective this article is to study the impact of globalization to Indonesia as a developing country leading to emergence of the problem of globalization trap. In this respect globalization trap can be defined as a phenomenon in which globalization has led to a country stuck in a puddle of economic problems such as debt, poverty, dependency and so the imbalance of international relations that have an impact on the country's inability to get out of these problems. Meanwhile, Charles Gore prefers to speak about the poverty trap. He argues that the imbalance of international relations within the framework of globalization has also led to a poverty trap. He defines poverty trap as a situation in which poverty has effects which act as causes of poverty. There are thus vicious circles, processes of circular and cumulative causation, in which poverty outcomes reinforce themselves (Gore, 2003: 2).

The process of globalization which is driven and controlled by the forces of neoliberals through the WTO (World Trade Organization) and the advanced industrial countries have created conditions in which the third world countries are 'forced' to implement free trade policy or they will be isolated in the international arena which is dominated by capitalist countries. But globalization often force third the world countries to sacrifice national interests to follow the trend of globalization and regional cooperation as a 'vehicle' of liberalization. It is very interesting that Indonesia may be a typical example of how issues of globalization and regionalization responded aggressively without considering internal readiness which in turn resulting the dilemma in securing its national interests and it has been causing the increasing the globalization trap that cannot be solved by Indonesian government. By using historical perspective and analysis this article is trying to trace the historical process of the globalization trap suffered by Indonesia. For this purpose this article discusses some issues, i.e. the historical

process from globalization to colonization since the early time to the 20th century, issue of colonialism and regionalism, the position of Indonesia in their regional architecture in Southeast Asia and Asia-Pacific regions, and last but not least the actual globalization trap faced by Indonesia.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This article is actually discussing a recent phenomenon, i.e. the globalization trap which has been suffering Indonesia especially since the New Order period. This recent phenomenon will be analysed historically. It means that this article is a historical work used recent phenomenon as a point of departure (Sulistiyono, 2008). By using such kind of perspective, this article intends to show the important of history in contributing to understand actual problems which are experienced by the society. It is inline with the opinion of Benedetto Croce that historiography is actually a *contemporary thought about the past* (Garraghan, 1957: 21).

It is important to be understood that historical research should not merely use methodology and epistemology applied by positivists treating historical sources rigidly and quantitatively and are viewed as 'able to speak for themselves' as it is happen in natural sciences. It is argued that history is benefitted not for the human in the past but it is really for the interests of the nowadays people as well as for the future Meyerhoff, 1959: 44). In this connection historian should speak in the name of historical sources. It cannot speak for itself. For this purpose, in composing this article historical method was used.

Historical method comprises the techniques and guidelines by which historians use primary sources and other evidences, including the evidence of archaeology, to research and then to write histories in the form of accounts of the past (Gottschalk, 1983; 32). Historical method comprises several steps as follows: tracing and collecting data (*heuristic*), appraisal data (*critic*), analyzing and interpretation of data, and utilizing the data for

composing the research report. The sources used in this research mainly in the form of secondary sources such as books, journal article, selected information from internet, etc. The sources will be criticized for its authenticity and credibility. Source criticism can be elaborated by at least six question: (1) When was the source, written or unwritten, produced (date); (2) Where was it produced (localization); (3) By whom was it produced (authorship); (4) From what pre-existing material was it produced (analysis); (5) In what original form was it produced (integrity); (6) What is the evidential value of its contents (credibility). (Garraghan, 1957: 168). Interpretation will be addressed to understand the meaning and to search for its relevance and then written in the form of historical writing (Wasino, 2007; 2016:64).

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **From Globalization to Colonization**

Indonesia actually has experienced several 'wave of globalizations'. The first wave of globalization occurred during the burgeoning of the maritime trade routes between East and West in the early centuries AD following the decline of the caravan trade (overland trade route) of central Asia. This overland Silk Road was an interconnected series of overland Routes connecting eastern part of Asia to Europe through Central Asia. The decline of this caravan trade was preconditioned the development of the maritime Silk Road traversed by ocean vessel, and connecting China in the east and the Roman Empire in the west since the early of the Christian era. Its length was more than 8,000 km long. Its influence carried over into Japan and Korea. The influence of the maritime Silk Road was significant not only for the development and flowering of the great civilizations of China, ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, India and Rome but also helped to lay the foundations of the modern world ("*Silk Road*", 2017).

The second wave occurred after the expansion of European imperialism and capitalism since the 16th century. The mo-

mentum of the first wave of globalization can be utilized intelligently by the people in the archipelago. While the second wave was not entirely successfully anticipated by local forces in Indonesia, so in the long term Indonesian archipelago became the 'victims' of globalization.

As it is known that after entering the first phase of the wave of globalization (since the early of Christian era), Indonesian islands became were part of the global maritime trade network (maritime Silk Road). Due to its geographical factors, maritime Silk Road of Southeast Asia was dominated by maritime trade routes. The Indonesian archipelago had an important position within the context of maritime Silk Road. It extended from South China, to present-day Philippines, Brunei, Indonesian Archipelago, Siam, Malacca, Ceylon, India, Persia, Egypt, Italy, Portugal and Sweden.

The insular character of the Indonesian archipelago has offered easy access to foreign influences. The fact that the Archipelago produced many plentiful commodities attracted both traders and conquerors; it consequently made the islands and the sea a battle field of many contesting powers. In addition, the economic significance of the Indonesian archipelago is due to the fact that it has abundantly produced commodities that are so needed by the industrial countries. The characteristic of the Indonesian archipelago also causes great variation stemming from climate and volcanic activities, which in turn influence human habitation and cultural development. Fertile soil can also be found in the islands of Sumatra, Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Flores, Wetar and Banda, as well as a part of Sulawesi since these areas are volcanic regions. The remaining islands, such as Papua and Kalimantan, have not demonstrated any recent volcanic activities although there are high mountains. Two types of climate and geology provide a variety of tropical commodities in the Archipelago (Broek, 1942: 3).

In the Indonesian archipelago, tropical wet climates are very dominant. Climate change mainly depends on the mon-

soon. There are only two seasons, dry season and wet (rainy) season. The wet season lasts from October to April and results from the north-western monsoon (wet monsoon), which begins to blow in September. The wet season comes to an end when this monsoon stops. It is followed by the dry south-eastern monsoon starting in June and ending in September. In Indonesian history, traditional regular shipping and trade activities benefited from those periodic changes brought on by monsoons. It can be recognized that the cycle of monsoons on the Indonesian archipelago's waters facilitated interregional shipping and trade among islands in the Indonesian archipelago. It also provided the means of interconnection between the Indonesian archipelago and the areas beyond preconditioning the Indonesian archipelago to be an open system of world shipping and trade network. Climate diversity and differences in soil fertility among the islands stimulated both interregional and international trades.

The economic situation of the population in the Indonesian archipelago varies. It mainly relates to the variety in commodities produced by different regions. Since ancient times Java was a major exporter of rice commodity. The islands in the eastern archipelago were known as the producer of spices. Meanwhile, Sumatra produced pepper which was much needed in the trade between the West and East. Java in this case played an important role as a catalyst between the islands of the archipelago (east) with the countries in the West.

Indonesia has a strategic geographical position along international maritime Silk Road between the two superpowers at that time, namely India and China. It was therefore not a coincidence that the population of the archipelago actively took part in the trade. They were highly civilized and productive people (Gunder-Frank, 1998: 91). Historical evidence shows that since the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD there had been trade relations between Indonesian people and India. Furthermore, since the 5<sup>th</sup> century various states in the archipelago had

sent trade envoys to China. Spices (pepper, cloves, nutmeg) of Maluku, Aceh, South Sumatra, West Java, were a popular commodity everywhere. Sandalwood of Nusa Tenggara, benzoic from Sumatra and the frankincense from Borneo, Sumatra, and Sulawesi were well-demanded by the people of India and China for the sake of religious ceremonies. In contrast, trade commodity of China was also demanded by the people of the Indonesian archipelago, especially for the sake of prestige among the elites. Commodities from China which were very popular in the Indonesian archipelago were silk and the porcelain items such as plates, bowls, cups, vases and so forth. Meanwhile, Indian traders sold good quality of cloth.

At that time India and China were the two advanced and rich superpowers. Among them was a close trading relationship which in turn also involved the surrounding trade routes in the Indonesia archipelago. This economic development could be benefitted well by local inhabitants of the archipelago by establishing political and economic as well as cultural centers. It can be seen from the emergence and development of various kingdoms in the archipelago such as those of Srivijaya in Sumatra (7-13th century) and Singasari-Kediri-Majapahit kingdoms in Jawa (12-15th century) and then followed by Islamic kingdoms (Sulistiyono, 2003).

During the expansion of Islam to the east, trade was also enlivened by other nations in Asia such as the Arabs, Iranians, Turks, Indian Moslems and so forth (Curtin, 1998: 109-127; Soeroto, 1976: 11). This phenomenon also stimulated the emergence of maritime Islamic kingdoms in the Indonesian archipelago such as those of Samudera Pasai (13th century), Aceh Sultanate (1496 – 1903), Palembang Sultanate (17th – 19th) in Sumatra; Demak Sultanate (15th – 16th century), Cirebon Sultanate (since the 15th century), Bantam Sultanate (16th – 19th century), etc in Java, Banjarmasin Sultanate (16th – 19th century) in Kalimantan, Goa Kingdom in Sulawesi (since the 14th century), Ternate and Tidore Sultanates in Maluku

islands (since the 13th century), etc.

One of the dynamic forces of interregional shipping and trade was the interdependence of supply and demand between regions in the Indonesian archipelago. Since the pre-colonial era, Java supplied rice to the Outer Islands such as the Maluku Islands and even Malacca. The Outer Islands produced cash crops, such as spices and many kinds of forest products. People in Java did not consume these commodities on a large scale but these goods were re-exported to Western countries. A kind of barter took place, in which local people obtained textiles, metal goods, jewelry, etc. in exchange for spices. Shortly, there had been a certain degree of specialization in supply and demand in trading system among regions in the Indonesian archipelago.

The maritime trade system underwent adjustments when Southeast Asia region was entering the second wave of globalization following the advent of Westerners in the Archipelago. An armed-trading system developed by Western seafarers struck a big blow to the local traders, who had been established there for centuries (Manguin in Reid, 1993: 198–199). A set of wars and diplomacies finally preconditioned the Portuguese controlled some economic centers in the Indonesian archipelago. Although the intervention of the Western powers was very complicated during the first century of their presence in the Indonesian archipelago, it did not change the basic pattern of trade. The conquest of Malacca by Portuguese in 1511 only provoked the emergence of discrete Muslim-trading centers on the Straits of Malacca such as Aceh, Johor, and Brunei. At the same time, the militant Christianity of the Portuguese had also a certain role in stimulating the growth of many emporiums along the north coast of Java such as Demak, Bantam, Cirebon, Surabaya, etc. The presence of the Portuguese as competitors of the Muslim traders in Southeast Asia indirectly helped the Javanese revival after the fall of the Majapahit kingdom at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup>

century.

Economic growth of coastal states along the north coast of Java was not only viewed suspiciously by the Portuguese in Malacca but also by the Mataram Kingdom, the newly emerged powerful inland kingdom of Java. Mataram began to conquer these city-states in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century with the exception of Bantam (Siddique, 1977). Mataram destroyed almost all the economic resources of those coastal states, resulting in an exodus of traders to various ports in the Outer Islands, such as Makassar and Banjarmasin (De Graaf & Pigeaud, 1989: 24–26; Burger, 1975: 26). Later the economic development of these coastal states was too costly. All trading cities along the north coast of Java, except Bantam, were weak when the Dutch began to expand their monopoly here in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

The development of capitalism in Europe revealed new redevelopment not only in Europe itself but also in the Indonesian archipelago. The explorations and conquests carried out by Portuguese and Spanish in Southeast Asia had widened a path for capitalist countries to expand their control over the economic centers. The advance in technological development accompanied by economic development in Europe eventually enabled the new emerging capitalist nations such as the Dutch and the British to weaken the old powers (especially Portuguese and Spain) and controlled most part of the Indonesian archipelago until the end of the World War II.

Their policy of monopoly was imposed on both other Westerners and the indigenous people following their general trade policy. The VOC also imposed their right of purchasing commodities for the Amsterdam market on local peasants and traders, particularly as there was no free market where local people could sell their products at a higher price. Here, the VOC was an arbitrary power in determining the selling price of local products. The VOC prohibited the sale of spices to other Europeans under the threat of punishment (Nagtegaal, 1996: 21). The seizure of Ma-

kassar by the VOC in 1667, for example, caused a large scale migration of traders from South Sulawesi to the north coast of Java.

In their early presence in the archipelago, the VOC aspired to supply the main trading network of Southeast Asia centered in the Straits of Malacca (port of Malacca) and the Straits of Sunda (Batavia), but by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, this began to change. From 1677 onwards, the Dutch were actively involved in a series of succession disputes and dynastic struggles in Java (Burger, 1975: 26–37).

Exploiting such conflicts, the Dutch then took advantage of the opportunity to reduce the indigenous powers to a state of dependence. Not until the third quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, did the Dutch gradually succeed making Mataram, Bantam and to a certain degree Cirebon vassals of the VOC. Moreover, in Java they gained economic control over the most productive areas of this island by means of tax levies and many kinds of tribute from their vassals. The VOC also introduced new crops such as coffee. In so doing, they gradually transformed their system into a Java-based polity, concentrating more and more on the exploitation of natural resources of Java, while their maritime power and grip on trade in the Outer Islands areas declined (Cowan, 1968: 10; Gaastra & Bruijn 1993: 178; Gaastra, 2002: 57–65). VOC finally did not only give attention to trade activities but also expand their business to control production areas for supporting their trade activities which in turn revealing the process of colonization and subjugation. In this connection, the system which was developed by the VOC became the basis of the Dutch colonial government following its bankruptcy in the end of 1799.

Western Imperialism and colonialism were not only experienced by Indonesia but also other countries in Southeast Asian region. Even the existing of present Southeast Asian countries can be considered as the colonial inheritance. Western

colonialists partitioned Southeast Asian territory into the sphere of influence based on their interests and territorial claims. State borders among Southeast Asian countries were determined by colonial power without previous rapprochement with the local inhabitants or by young national governments unable to make agreements with the various local ethnic groups for arranging local administration (Ricklefs, 1981: 138; Henley, 1996: 5). What the so called the present day Indonesia was claimed as the Dutch possession, Malaysia was owned by the British, the Phillipines was controlled by the Spain, the France governed Indo-China, and Portuguese claimed East Timor territory.

The above explanation gives a clear picture that the first wave of globalization since early days of the Christian era could be well responded by Indonesian people. It can be seen from the rise and fall of many political, economic, and cultural centers in the Indonesian archipelago ranging from Mataram and Srivijaya kingdoms to Islamic kingdoms before the coming of the Westerners. In the meantime, the second wave of globalization which was accompanied by imperialism and colonialism could not be successfully anticipated by local peoples. The result was that Indonesian archipelago and most parts of other regions in Southeast Asian areas were colonized by the Westerners until the end World War II.

### **Colonialism and Regionalism: Southeast Asia, Asia-Pacific, and East Asia**

Parceling of Southeast Asian territory into Western colonies did not end the problem. Many local resistances colored the history of Western colonies in this region since the beginning of their presence till the end of the World War II. Conflicts and the threats of war in this region also emerged from colonial powers itself, especially from 'the new comers' such as those of the USA, Germany, and then followed by Japan. Even the tense did not only occur in Southeast Asia but also escalated to Asia-Pacific region. This means that the

'battle field' was not only include South-east Asian region which had lasted since the 16th century but it extended to what the so called Asia-Pacific territory.

A native politician in the Dutch colonial period, M. Soetardjo, in a preface of a book written by Dr. G.S.S.J. Ratu Langie he, in 1937, said (Langie, 1982: 11):

The term Pacific in recent years is constantly moving the tongue and pen. The special meaning of the term lies in the fact that the term seems to lead to different emotions depending on the words uttered by a white or a color.

The statementt indicates that the Asia-Pacific region becomes increasingly important in global politics since the early of the 20th century. What the so called Asia Pacific is a combination of two words that sound somewhat odd because Asia points to a continental or mainland, while the Pacific points to an ocean. Thus literally, the concept Asia Pacific includes all countries in the Asian continent from Turkey to the west and east of Korea; Russia to the north and Malaysia in the south. In this case the islands of Japan, Indonesia, Philippines and the countries located in the Pacific region such as Australia, New Zealand, and several other island nations such as Hawaii, Samoa, and the like which are often referred to as Oceania may be inserted in the Pacific region.

### **The Two World Wars**

Strangeness of the combination between Asia and the Pacific will come when the phrase is viewed from a historical dimension. Asia is a region that had long appeared in the stage of history and civilization even older than any center of civilization in the world. European nations were still learning to write his own name when the Chinese, Babylonians, and India had studied the complicated natural sciences and the humanities. Instead, before entering the Age of Exploration of Ocean (the Age of Discovery), which began around the 15th century, the Pacific region such

as Australia was still regarded by Westerners as *terra incognita* (unknown areas). Of course, such views are not all true, and only a European-centric point of view. Before James Cook beached in Australia, the Makassarese used to sail there and had a socio-cultural relations with the Australian population. However, because 'history is written by the winners' then the history records the Westerner as the inventor of 'the Continent Kangaroos'. Aboriginal people who have 'discovered' the continent since about 3000 years BC is not recognized their achievement.

Although the Asia Pacific region has become a field of Western colonial exploitation for about 300 years, its development as an integrated area has been very slow. This is related to the fact that although economic development of each colonial state moved quickly but not conducive to the development of a regionalism. Each of the colonies was placed as a satellite of their respective mother country. Indonesian archipelago became a satellite of the Netherlands, Malaysia became the satellite British Empire, Indo-China oriented to the French, and so on. Perhaps it is true that the colonial countries experienced economic growth but they were sucked by the mother country. Economic relations among colonized countries in Asia Pacific did not developed significantly before entering the twentieth century compared to those of the economic activity in the Atlantic region. A Dutch observer of international economics at the inter bellum period proposed that the shipping relations between the Dutch East Indies and the Pacific Ocean along with Indian Ocean in 1910 were only 26% whereas the voyage relationship with the Atlantic region reached 74% (Blink, 1922: 328).

Meanwhile, the United States who has achieved independence in 1776 and has achieved significant economic growth is less to expand surrounding areas before the mid-19th century. Even in the year 1823 President James Monroe declared the doctrine known as the Monroe Doctrine proposing that "America for Americans and Americans for America". In the

context of that doctrine, the U.S. will not engage in aggression and coercion to other countries. However, in line with economic and industrial development in America who were supported by a wealth of nature, and driven by the development of the conflicting international political situation, the Americans finally broke his own doctrine by doing "gunboat diplomacy" to open Japan in 1853. By using the guise of free trade and democratization, U.S. kicked Spain from the Philippines, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Guam in the late 19th century (Okuda, 1994: 2).

Interesting development came from an experiment initiated by Spain to create a network between Spain in European, colonies of the Americas and the Philippines by making the later as a center of trade that would suck the economic activity in the Asia Pacific region. However, before its success to build a regionalism in this area, Spanish colonial government in the Philippines was destroyed by the United States in 1898 ("Spanish-American War", 2016)

This phenomenon marked the emergence of a new stage of world history with full of tension and turmoil with the complicated players which resulted the conflicting drama on Asia-Pacific stage. Asia-Pacific region became the center of the world drama in the 20th century, and perhaps also in later centuries. Who were the players on the drama stage of Asia-Pacific region? The first is China which was a big country with a huge number of population and invaluable historical heritage. Although like such an old dragon with its fragile teeth, China actually still has tremendous power. This country is located in the southeastern Pacific. The second is the United States located in the eastern Pacific. Uncle Sam's country is a big country with young energetic power backed with abundant wealth. The third is the Japanese empire which also had a young spirit who was very aggressive like a hungry tiger. This country had successfully adopted Western progress including imperialistic attitude. Japanese archipelago is located in the northern tip of the Pa-

cific Ocean. Japanese position can be likened to the British position in Europe. The Fourth is the British who at that time had colonies with a strategic position as keeper of both the Pacific gateway to the west (the straits of Malacca) and the east (Australia, Papua New Guinea and New Zealand) who becomes a sort of "protector" for the fifth and sixth players, i.e. the Dutch who colonized the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia) and French who subjugated Indo-China. The Seventh is the Russia that lies on the north end of Pacific. Although had been defeated by Japan in 1905 but it rose again as a giant bear who always had the ambition to search for warm water ports in the Pacific ocean (Roosevelt, 1928: 2-3).

Toward the Pacific War, the forces mentioned above have built the tense political, economic, and military relationships. There were several hot spots that had the potential for turbulent at that time. The southern part of Pacific region which included British colonies (New Zealand, Australia, Papua New Guinea and the British colonies of Malaya) and the Dutch in the Indonesian archipelago had relatively safe and stable situation. Both colonialists were able to exploit agriculture (rubber, sugar, coffee, tea, etc.) and mineral resources (iron ore, tin, and oil) which defined the life and death in industrialized countries. In China, there was confrontation between the great powers, namely the capitalist forces of the south (English, French, and United States), the resistance of Western-educated nationalists, and the international communist influence from Russia. In the Philippines, the United States had managed to strengthen his power, although applying the political system which was very different from the 'old colonial', namely by applying a democratic political system. The Philippines became stepping stones for the United States to enter more deeply into the heart of Asia Pacific. At the beginning of the 20th century Americans also have a huge interest in Asia Pacific. American capital has spread in the Philippines, Dutch East Indies, and China. At the



north end of the Pacific region, the Japanese empire had become a mature power to demolish the old forces of China and Russia as well as competed against other European imperialists in the Asia Pacific region. It is clear those respective great powers facing each other in the Asia Pacific region. They were ready to fight for gaining power in order to control the power sources of capitalism, namely raw materials (agriculture, plantation, and mining) and the market (with a population of about 510 million before the World War I) (Blink, 1922: 325).

One of the driving forces that fueled the fight in the stage of Asia-Pacific at the time was Japanese. After the Meiji Restoration in Japan in 1868 following the Japanese breaking conducted by Commodore Perry in 1854, Japan became a modern industrial state. Because of its rapid industrial development, Japan had to face serious problem with the requirements of natural resources (raw materials) and marketing areas. Japan was the poor of raw materials with saturated domestic market. To overcome this problem Japan had to execute imperialism. Meanwhile most of the Asia Pacific region had been 'exhausted' by the Western imperialism, except China and Russia. Japan thought that the conquest would enable to exploit its natural resources and to control the market for Japanese industrial products. The first region annexed by Japan was the Kurile Islands (Russia) in 1875; the next was the Ryukyu Islands (China) in 1879. China-Japan War I (1894-1895) produced the island of Formosa (now Taiwan).

After defeating Russia in 1905, Japan got the South Sakhalin and the South Manchuria. The Japanese victory was a driving force of nationalism movements in colonized countries in Asia and Africa to fight Western colonialism. Japanese movement to annex surrounding areas continued. In 1910 Japan annexed Korea, Manchuria's turn in 1931. In World War I (1914-1918) Japan along with some Western countries joined the Allies against the Central group with Germany as the strongest member. Versailles Treaty of

1919 recognized Japan's annexation of German colonies which includes Shantung Province in China, Marshall Islands, Mariana Islands and the Carolina Islands in the Pacific Ocean.

However, Japanese alliance in World War I, especially the United States (U.S.) and the British, worried about the progress of Japan. They tried to limit the Japanese movement in many ways. Japan considered that this Western attitude was seen as a form of malice. Meanwhile, the global economic crisis of 1929 that also hit Japan had provided the opportunity ultra-nationalists groups to hold government leadership. They argued that Japan needed a drastic change in the internal reform and external conquest. The conquest continues with the main target area of China that erupted Chinese-Japanese War (7 July 1937 – 2 September 1945). Only two years could Japan capture about 30 percent of the Chinese territory. China was forced release its coastal areas and confined.

In line with the tense situation in Europe stemming from the conflicting situation between the emerging Axis Powers (Germany and Italy) and the Allies, there was also the increasing political temperature in Asia-Pacific marked by the approaching of Japan to the Axis Powers in Europe. To stop the Japanese war machine and industry, American, British and Dutch embargoed Japan since July 1941. After negotiations failed, the Japanese began to think that to control the Asia Pacific must first paralyze the U.S. forces in the region, especially the American military base at Pearl Harbor. On 7 December 1941 Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and was followed by aggression to various regions in East and Southeast Asia by encouraging anti-Western. Thus the Pacific War broke out, or according to the Japanese version is called the Greater East Asia War, the World War in the Pacific region.

World War II ended. Much had been changes in political and military maps as a result of the war. Recovery after the war in the Asia-Pacific region began

with the occupation of Japan by the United States and Japanese conquered territories by the other member of the Allies. According to members of the Allied conference, the U.S. and the UK were the main players in this case. Supporting players were the Soviet Union and China. However, cooperation during the war could not be maintained. Bi-polarization of power occurred between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. In China, the nationalist-communist battle raged back and the division of Korea was lingering. In the Southeast Asia, the indigenous uprising came against Western imperialism. New states emerged in the former French, Dutch, U.S., and British colonies. A new chapter on the political drama began on the Asia-Pacific stage.

### **The Cold War**

After the Pacific War ended, the Asia Pacific region entered a new phase as a dynamic drama stage. Pacific War had preconditioned the emergence of new states following the decolonization process which cannot be avoided by the colonialist countries. New countries included among others North Korea, South Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, and so on. Meanwhile, major countries also still exist such as the United States, China, and Australia. In the meantime Japan which lost the war had to accept the American occupation forces to perform demilitarization.

The end of the World War II and the Pacific War also preconditioned the bi-polarization of global power between capitalist countries led by the United States and the socialist countries led by the Soviet Union. Ideological conflict of the two superpowers was often manifested in the various political, military, economic, and cultural conflicts. On one side the capitalist bloc countries tried to stem the influence of socialism, while the socialist bloc was very proactive to spread socialism. However, open political and military conflicts did not occur either in the U.S. and

the Soviet Union itself, but occurred in the newly independent Third World countries. In many places, there were direct confrontation and war between pro-capitalist against pro-socialist forces, such as in Vietnam, Korea, and Indonesia.

Open conflict occurred when the drama stage of Asia-Pacific was dominated by two superpowers. Countries in the Asia Pacific region that had to choose between affiliated to the capitalists or the Socialist bloc, although the latter was not solid because it fragmented between the Soviet Union and the Chinese sides. South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea might clearly be classified as part of the capitalist block, while the Socialist bloc including North Korea, China, and North Vietnam. Outside of that there are countries that did not follow the existing two blocks, but following the Non-Aligned Movement, including Indonesia. However, the shadow of the Cold War was coloring the historical development of nations in Asia Pacific. At that time in the world capitalist bloc formed NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) in April 1949. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union sponsored the founding of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 which consists of the socialist countries of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Soviet Union. Although tensions between the two defense pacts was especially true in Europe, but of course tense atmosphere could also be felt in the Asia-Pacific region.

In order to stem the socialism in the Asia Pacific, especially in Southeast Asia, whether from China or the Soviet Union, America also encouraged the establishment of SEATO defense pact in 1955. Although when viewed from the SEATO organization's name should only include Southeast Asia, but the reality was very broad membership includes Australia, Bangladesh, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom, and United States.

Reaction to the existence of SEATO was dependent on domestic political de-

velopments in each country. This can be seen from the case of Indonesia. When the SEATO was established, the principle of Indonesian foreign policy was independent and active, although there was a tendency to hostile to the Western powers. In addition to relating to anti-Western sentiments that developed during the Independence War, it is also related to the tension between Indonesia and the Netherlands on the issue of West Papua and Dutch involvement to help runaway leaders RMS (Republic of South Moluccas) and the development of the Indonesian Communist Party which had an anti-capitalist stance. The involvement of the United States in the PRRI (Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Indonesia) revolt in 1958 pushed Indonesia's foreign policy tends to 'left oblique' (*'serong kiri'*). This was evidenced by the words of President Sukarno who wanted to build Phnom Penh-Jakarta-Hanoi-Peking-Pyongyang axis, a kind of cooperation among anti-Western countries in Asia Pacific region. Indonesia openly began to dare to challenge not only Dutch but also American and English within the framework of "Crash Malaysia" since 1963.

Meanwhile, in a frontal war in Vietnam, the United States was defeated by the communist forces. Therefore, if the United States failed to defend Indonesia from communist domination, the capitalist bloc position in Asia-Pacific would be very vulnerable. Thus, Indonesia was last gamble for victory of capitalist bloc in Asia-Pacific region. Various efforts were made to eliminate the influence of communism power and neutralize the regime in Indonesia. At the time Indonesia began to take an important role in the drama on the Asia-Pacific stage. In addition to having the potential of abundant natural resources with huge market potential, the capitalist countries especially the Dutch, British, and United States also had economic interests and large investments in plantations, mining, and banking in Indonesia.

With the occurrence of a very complex event in 1965, Sukarno finally suc-

ceeded to be stepped down and communism could be removed from Indonesia with a very big sacrifice. Suharto's regime marked the emergence of a new era in regional architecture, especially in Southeast Asia (which is also part of the Asia-Pacific region) to spearhead the establishment of ASEAN in 1967. At that time, ASEAN was not intended to be siding with one bloc in the Cold War, but cannot be denied that the emergence of ASEAN was also part of the 'establishment' of new block that even though formally follow the lines of the Non-Aligned movement, but in fact had an anti-communist and not anti-(if not pro) capitalists. Even at that time ASEAN could play an important role in American eyes as one of the anticommunist bulwark in Southeast Asia. Similarly, Indonesia, though still hard-working with the Non-Aligned Movement, but in practice more likely to side with the capitalist bloc and the anti-socialist bloc. This has been demonstrated by Indonesia with the politics of anti-communism and the annexation of East Timor which was considered a nest of communism movement. Indonesian relations with capitalist countries increasingly intimidated. In line with the increasing domestic security situation, much investment from the United States, Japan, Australia and European countries entered Indonesia.

### **Being a Tamer of the Contesting Giants?**

If during the Cold War, the structure of global relations was more bipolar in which the U.S. and the Soviet Union taking a binary position facing each other, however, the structure changed after one's strengths (Soviet Union) collapsed in 1990. Many people worried that the collapse of the Soviet Union would put the United States as the sole dominant force in the world, thus forming a mono-polar structure. Apparently the fear is not entirely proven. America itself was also vulnerable to the recent economic crisis. Post-Cold War enabled the emergence of multi-polar structure in global relations. This multi-polarity is marked by the emergence and development of new giants like China

and India in addition to the power of the old giants of the European Union, the United States, and Japan. Thus it seems clear that the super giant mostly located in Asia and the Pacific region, namely India, China and America. They are not only industrial countries but also have a large market opportunity. Based on the data in 2007, the total population of China, India, United States, Indonesia, and Japan were 3,093,000,000 people, or 47.1% of the total population of the world. It is very interesting that the multi-polarity seems to develop in the Asia Pacific region (“World Population”, 2016)

The end of the Cold War also marked by the growing popularity of ‘new world order’ called globalization. New picture of this world is based on the development of universally recognized, namely: a sharp increase in international trade, investment, the flow of capital, advances in technology and the increasing role of multilateral institutions at the same time weakening the sovereignty of country leading to what is often imagined as a ‘global village’. But it seems that globalization still limited mainly on the field of communication and information traffic by using the internet and other telecommunications and transportation facilities. Meanwhile, economic traffic (such as labor, services, and capital) is still facing obstacles of standardization. That is why the issue of economic globalization, which is represented in trade liberalization through negotiations within the WTO / World Trade Organization, the real regionalism still, has an important role in economic development in certain areas such as the EU cooperation. Of course, the ideal of regional cooperation is cooperation that is more set forth in an effort to build a peaceful and not a race to pursue a hegemonic power. This is consistent with what has been said by Kim Dae-Jung that globalization can succeed only if supported by a healthy foundation of regionalism (Widyahartono, 2009: 16).

The interesting question is how can Indonesia play an important role in regional architecture of Asia-Pacific

(including Southeast Asia and East Asia) in the future? The first thing to be underlined is that historically Indonesia has a decisive role on the regional architecture in Southeast Asia. This phenomenon can be exemplified by the establishment of SEATO in 1954 and the ASA (Association of Southeast Asia) in 1961. Without the support and involvement of Indonesia, those regional co operations could not exist as expected. Only when, in 1967 Indonesia to spearhead the establishment of regional cooperation organizations, namely ASEAN, a regional organization in Southeast Asia could stand firm and developed until now. At that time, the member of ASEAN were Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand. Only after the Asian financial crisis of 1997-1998, Indonesia was not able to play an active role in ASEAN until 2003, when Indonesia began to put himself in front of the ranks of the ASEAN organization.

The second point also needs to stressed is that at the moment when the Cold War was ‘over’, ASEAN still exists and even has a significant bargaining position in the constellation of inter-regional relationship in the world. Some liken the ASEAN as a beautiful girl who every man wants to apply and have it. One factor why ASEAN can live a long life is precisely because ASEAN is not a military cooperative organization that depend on the situation of war, but more emphasis on cooperation to accelerate economic growth, social progress, cultural development among its members, to maintain peace and stability in the region, and provide the opportunity for its members to dialog for solving differences in a peaceful manner. Such cooperation became more and more crucial (“ASEAN”, 2016).

Instead ASEAN also increasingly look pretty nice-looking as its members grow more and its economic potential more develops. With a population of more than 600 million and with abundant natural wealth ASEAN would be a potential market in the future (“Association of Southeast Asian Nations”, 2016). With

the beauty and richness, many developed countries want to cooperate with ASEAN both bilaterally with each member as well as multilaterally among certain countries with the ASEAN countries together. Even industrialized countries such as China, Japan, Korea, and Australia want to be part of a broader regional cooperation with ASEAN countries as a driving force. This can be seen from the efforts to establish the ASEAN Plus Three. Asian Plus Three which is initiated since 1997 is a forum that serves as a coordinator of cooperation between ASEAN and the countries of East Asia namely China, Japan and Korea. The idea of formation of the ASEAN Plus Three has become increasingly felt very important as an effort to overcome the Asian Financial Crisis that occurred in late 1997. Therefore, this forum is officially institutionalized in 1999. Starting from this forum, the steps were further developed to form EAF (East Asian Forum) in 2002 which has 10 member countries of ASEAN plus China, Japan, Korea. In a series of its meetings, EAF devised a plan to build what so called East Asian Community in the future ("East Asia Community", 2016)

However there is battle of ideas between some ASEAN countries on the expansion of the broader scope of regional cooperation. China and Malaysia prefer to develop the ASEAN + 3 to build the East Asia cooperation in the future. Meanwhile, Indonesia proposed to include India, Australia, and New Zealand. Singapore was originally only supports the entry of India, but then agreed to all of Indonesian proposal. Eventually East Asia Summit (EAS) was successfully formed whose membership consisting of member countries of ASEAN plus six countries or ASEAN + 6 (Japan, Korea, China, India, Australia and New Zealand) in 2004. The first meeting of ASEAN + 6 held in 2005. The battle of ideas continues among ASEAN countries. Malaysia seems to still at its stance that the ASEAN + 3 should be strengthened to build East Asia community as was rolled on the 7th East Asia Forum held in Seoul on 1-2 September

2009 by taking a very optimistic themes, namely: "Accelerating the Integration for the East Asian Community Building". Meanwhile, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, and Cambodia want to strengthen EAS. Even the Philippines and Vietnam proposed to include Russia to be a member of the EAS. Likewise, the Philippines is also pushing the United States to take part in the EAS. Meanwhile, Indonesia and Singapore more emphasize efforts to strengthen ASEAN as the driving force for EAS or ASEAN + 6 (APS), before going wider.

It is easily understood that Indonesia's attitude to tend to develop the EAS with ASEAN remains as the driving force. This is related to some objective conditions. First, in the history of ASEAN, Indonesia almost always had the significant status and significant. Therefore, if the scope of ASEAN cooperation is replaced with the ASEAN + 3 (APT), it is possible that Indonesia's role will increasingly dwarfed because in the APT constellation China will be the dominant force. It is feared that with the development of APT which will become an embryo of 'East Asian Community' will shrink the role of ASEAN itself and thus also would decrease the role of Indonesia which have been the driving force of ASEAN. Second, for Indonesia, the development of APS is very rational in relation to the balance of power strategy in what will be formed as an "East Asian Community", or whatever its name. In the APS context, China will not be the only dominant force because there are India and Australia. Only in this equilibrium condition indeed Indonesia (or ASEAN) will be a driving force and guard the balance.

In connection with the proposal of Australian Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, in 1999 to initiate the establishment of the so-called Asia Pacific community, it is important for Indonesia to think about it in the context of a regional architecture that already exists. In this case Indonesia can take a consistent stance against the EAS. This means that the APC proposal can be further elaborated by developing

the concept of EAS. As it is known that members of the EAS is the ten ASEAN members plus Japan, Korea, China, India, Australia, and New Zealand. Of course the name of 'East Asia' is less precise if the last mentioned three countries involved. Therefore, using the name of Asia Pacific Summit or Asia Pacific Community may be more suitable than the East Asia Summit. It means that the EAS can be used as a basis for developing the APS or APC in the future with a membership that is still open and inclusive for countries in Asia Pacific regions including the United States, in which ASEAN remains a driving force in such a regional architecture ("Speech of Prime Minister of Australia on Shangri-La Dialog in Singapura, 29 May 2009", 2009). One of the most important considerations is that the proposed APC future-oriented considering the fact that not many people are very satisfied with the existing cooperative mechanism in this region. Most people desire that countries in the region will develop a region-wide cooperative mechanism similar to that of the European Union. If the APC can be materialized, the region would see fewer summits and more efficiency in cooperation ("East Asia Forum", 2016).

The proposed APC can be projected to be the ideal cooperative organization as in the constellation of the proposed APC such a balance of power will occur. The dragon (China) would not dare to act arbitrarily because there is Indian elephant, the American eagle, and Australian kangaroo. Only in this balance framework, could Indonesia or ASEAN have a smart role in the broadened regional architecture that includes not only ASEAN but also East Asia and the Asia-Pacific region. If Indonesia wants to remain a driving force in the constellation of Asia-Pacific regional architecture, Indonesia must be a wily tamer of dragons, elephants, eagles, and kangaroos at the same time. As a tamer, although Indonesia was much weaker than the tamed, it must be clever. If not, then the consequences are that Indonesia would be pounced by the dragon, headlong by the elephant, scratched by the ea-

gle, and finally kicked by the kangaroo.

### **"Globalization Trap"**

Indonesia may be one of the developing countries which are very eager to appear as a modern nation by showing himself with the tide of globalization and economic liberalization as campaigned by the developed countries. Indonesia has responded excessively to liberalization through the jargon of globalization and regionalization. That is, Indonesia is very open to free competition with the outside world while the internal condition has not been well prepared. Internal conditions include the bureaucracy and other institutions as well as the quality of human resources. Since the New Order government, dozens of bilateral, multilateral, and international agreements signed by the Indonesian government have to perform economic liberalization in the field of investment, trade, and labor.

Spirit of liberalization in Indonesia has grown tremendously when the Indonesian economy experienced contraction following the end of oil boom in the late 1970s. With the end of the heyday of oil and rubber, Indonesia should look for other alternatives to sustain its economic performance which was already moving quickly. To that end, the Indonesian government boosted non-oil exports. However, non-oil exports have been dominated by raw materials which did not give added value to the economy of Indonesia and even lead to the destruction of the environment. Meanwhile, to provide employment opportunities to the growing unemployment, the government began to expect foreign investors to open labor-intensive enterprises in Indonesia. Therefore economic liberalization began aggressively waged through the implementation of the deregulation and de-bureaucratization in 1980s in order to attract foreign investment.

Very monumental maneuvers conducted by Indonesia in 1994 when Indonesia was willing to be the host and initiator of APEC (Asia - Pacific Economic Cooperation). Some of the main objectives of

the APEC are to liberalize the economy of Asia - Pacific region. A very famous slogan at that time was: "like it or dislike, ready or not ready Indonesia should support liberalization and globalization". The euphoria of liberalization caused the abandoning of creating smart strategies and policies to strengthen national competitiveness and to protect national interests. Possibly they forgot that liberalization is not a matter of charity but it is hard competition. Within this context, China is the best example. This bamboo curtain country implements liberalization very carefully and accompanied with the variety of strategies for strengthening competitiveness especially in real sectors. Liberalization in the financial sector, banking, insurance, and investment were launched after the real sector was ready. They convinced that liberalization in the financial sector will strengthen the advanced real sector.

The different picture is experienced by Indonesia. Liberalization addressed with without suspicion. And even liberalization interpreted incorrectly. In this case the co-operation and economic openness was very aggressive. Indonesia believes that this policy will address social and economic issues, such as underdevelopment, unemployment and poverty. Therefore, Indonesia has always been in the forefront to push economic liberalization in international and regional cooperation. In addition to being a good country to the IMF and the WTO, Indonesia also becomes an example of aggressiveness in initiating FTA (Free Trade Agreement), for example, in the agreement with China, Japan, Korea, India, Australia, USA, Europe, and so on. Regional and international cooperation is a very good policy, but it must be preceded by a readiness internally.

Implementation of liberalization policies has implications for the declining state revenues from import duties. In 2011, Indonesia's import duties on agricultural sector has become very low, i.e. 13.6 per cent. China for example is about 21.4 percent and 43.2 percent Indian. In this case the import duty means of protection

against the expansion of imported goods. Thus the Indonesian government on the protection of domestic agricultural products is very weak when compared with China and India. Even more sad stories about Indonesia occurred in the industrial sector. Industrial commodity import duties cut to 4.2 percent, whereas the competitiveness of manufacturing exports still very weak because it is still dominated by primary commodities, which is between 60-70 percent. Meanwhile China is the most competitive country in the world in the manufacturing industry (95 percent of exports are manufacturing product) still apply about 10.5 percent of import duties and implement a series of non-tariff barriers (Saparini, 2013: 80-81). The same story also occurs in the AFTA (ASEAN Free Trade Agreement) which was implemented since 2010. After application of AFTA, Indonesia in ASEAN trade continues to decline (Adiningsih, 2013).

Indonesia has gradually caught up in the world of liberalization regime. This is due to the intervention of international financial institutions through various aid schemes which actually is a 'loan'. Assistance from the IMF (International Monetary Fund) for example has forced the Indonesian government to adjust its policy to the wishes of the IMF who is liberal in the areas of health, education, subsidies, natural resource management, the role of the state in the economy, privatization of state-owned enterprises and so on. Similarly, Bilateral Investment Treaty (BITs) is also an entrapment for Indonesia. Until now Indonesia has signed 63 BITs agreements with 63 states. Through BITs, Indonesia is very open to foreign investment, which in turn led to the exploitation of Indonesia's natural resources become uncontrollable. The agreement also allows Indonesia sued by foreign companies if Indonesia is in violation against the agreement. In 2012 for example, Indonesia has been sued by Churchill Mining Company with compensation claims of 2 billion USD through ICSD (International Centre for Settlement Dispute) (Damanik, 2013: 367-368).

Table 1. Strategic Sectors Opened for Foreign Investment

No.	Field of Business	Maximum range of foreign ownership
1.	Agriculture	49 – 95%
2.	Forestry	49 – 51%
3.	Marine and Fishery	ships over 100 GT and operating in the EEZ
4.	Energy and Mineral Resources	95%
5.	Defense	49%
6.	Public Work	55 – 95%
7.	Trade	95%
8.	Culture and Tourism	49 – 67%
9.	Department of Transportation	49 – 60%
10.	Communication & Informatics	49 – 95%
11.	Finance	80 – 99%
12.	Labor & Transmigration	49%
13.	Education	49%
14.	Health	49 – 75%

Source: Riza Damanik, “Kolonialisme Baru”, p. 373.

The adjustments of regulations made by the Indonesian government to the demands of liberalization can be seen from the Presidential Regulation No. 36/2010 concerning “List of Business Fields which are Closed and Open for Investment Requirements”. At least there are 14 strategic sectors that can be accessed by foreign companies. It can be seen from the table 1.

Liberalistic agreements which have been signed by Indonesian government and foreign countries as well as ‘structural adjustment’ to a more liberal in economic regulation have preconditioned Indonesia to be the inherent part of global economy. Such kinds of agreements and policies are perceived by many of Indonesian people as a trap. This closely links with the fact that Chinese manufacturing products as well as agricultural commodities has been overflowing Indonesian domestic market which in turn gives a big blow to the domestic products. In the meantime, Indonesian manufacturing products have to face a harder challenge in international market.

## **CONCLUSION**

From a historical perspective, Indonesia

steps to actively participate in regional architecture both at the level of ASEAN, East Asian, and Asia-Pacific is something that is inevitable. This historical process is actually driven by two major forces both external and internal. External force is closely related to the emergence of regional integration in the development trend of global geo-politics and geo-economics. Almost all people in the world witnessed the success stories of the EU integration process that began with economic issues such as the removal of trade barriers and monetary union.

By learning from the EU success story, many fundamental problems can be solved regionally within the spirit of togetherness such as the gap between the more developed countries and the less developed countries in the region. Likewise, the issue of national fanaticism can be reduced. With regional cooperation, regional problems can be solved more easily. Thus regional cooperation is a very strong trend in the 21st century that replaces cooperation based on ideology, as happened during the Cold War period.

However, eliminating the state's interest is not an easy task. Although developed countries have chanted slogans of



globalization and shared prosperity, but in reality they are still very protective. Thus the people of developing countries remain difficult to come and work in developed countries. Free trade and economic liberalization ultimately became the entry point for the developed countries in order to strengthen and establish their dominance over the developing countries. Thus free trade and liberalization is often a trap for developing countries.

Regional cooperation is sometimes also still tinged by sensitive racial issues, either in the level of ASEAN, East Asia, or Asia-Pacific. Perhaps the sensitivity of the problem is still often felt today when people talk about Australia in the framework of regional cooperation with Asian countries. Australian continent seems to be viewed as an enclave of Western people / white people in those areas of color. People understand that the enclave was built through a series of processes of domination and subjugation during the era of imperialism and colonialism. This reflects that the racist paradigm still influences the way people think in the 3rd millennium. It can also be seen how hard the Turkish state for EU membership mainly due to differences of race and religion.

In addition to racist sentiment in the macro level, regional cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (perhaps also in East Asia and Southeast Asia) are also still constrained by micro issues relating to the ways of thinking of each country to put forward their national interests than the interests of together to solve common problems and to achieve the same goal together. Perhaps what is considered by the countries which will make cooperation that is: "what benefit I get from the cooperation?", regardless the interests of other countries. At the level of 'mezzo', scheme for regional cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region for example still colored by geo-strategic suspicion about the balance of power in the region that was born from the experiences of the past and fears for the uncertain future. In this case the emerging forces such as China and India as well as old power which still exist such

as Japan and Australia became a major consideration in the context of regional architecture in Asia-Pacific.

## REFERENCES

- Adiningsih, Sri. 2013. "APEC dan Indonesia." *Kompas*, 30 September.
- Andre Gunder-Frank, Andre. 1998. *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California.
- "Association of Southeast Asian Nations." 2016. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved December 2, 2016 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Association\\_of\\_Southeast\\_Asian\\_Nations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Association_of_Southeast_Asian_Nations).
- "ASEAN". 2016. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved December 2, 2016 from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ASEAN>.
- Blink, H. 1922. "De Pacific in haar Economisch-Geographische Opkomst en Tegenwoordige Beteekenis", *Tijdschrift voor Economische Geographie*, 13, 15 September – 15 October 1922.
- Broek, J.O.M. 1942. *Economic development of the Netherlands Indies*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations.
- Bruijn J.R. & F.S. Gaastra (eds). 1993. *Ships, sailors and spices: East India Companies and their shipping in the 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries*. Amsterdam: NEHA.
- Burger, D.H. 1975. *Sociologisch-economische geschiedenis van Indonesia I*. Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute.
- Cowan, C.D. 1968. "Continuity and change in the international history of maritime South East Asia", *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, 9 (1).
- Croce, Benedito. "History and Cronicle", in: Hans Meyerhoff, *The Philosophy of History in Our Time: An Anthology*. New York: Anchor Original Publisher.
- Curtin, Philip D. 1998. *Cross-cultural Trade in World History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Damanik, Riza. 2013. "Kolonialisme Baru di Laut: Pergumulan, Perebutan, dan Pengkaplingan", in: Dorothea Rosa Herliany, dkk. (eds.), *Arus Balik: Memori Rempah dan Bahari Nusantara, Kolonialisme dan Pascakolonialisme* (Magelang: Samana Foundation, 2013). Pp. 367-368.
- De Graaf, H.J. & Th. Pigeaud. 1989. *Kerajaan-kerajaan Islam di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Grafiti Pers.

- "East Asia Community." 2016. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved November 23, 2016 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East\\_Asian\\_Community](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East_Asian_Community).
- East Asia Forum*. 2016. Retrieved November 21, 2016 from <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/tag/asia-pacific-community/>.
- Gaastra, F.S. 2002. *De geschiedenis van de VOC*. Zutphen: Walburg.
- Garraghan, Gilbert J. 1957. *A Guide to Historical Method*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Gore, Charles. 2003. *Globalization, the International Poverty Trap and Chronic Poverty in the Least Developed Countries*, Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper No. 30. Retrieved December 2, 2016 from: [http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication\\_files/-WP30\\_Gore.pdf](http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication_files/-WP30_Gore.pdf)
- Gottchalk, Louis. 1983. *Mengerti Sejarah*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Henley, David. 1996. *Nationalism and regionalism in a colonial context: Minahasa in the Dutch East Indies*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Langie, G.S.S.J. Ratu. 1982. *Indonesia di Pasifik*. Translated by S.I. Poeradisastra. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.
- Manguin, Pierre-Ives. 1993. "The vanishing jong: Insular Southeast Asian fleet in trade and war (Fifteenth to seventeenth centuries), in: A. Reid (ed.), *Southeast Asia in the early modern era: Trade, power, and belief*. Ithaca-London: Cornell University Press.
- Nagtegaal, L. 1996. *Riding the Dutch tiger: The Dutch East Indies Company and the Northeast Coast of Java 1680-1743*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Okuda, Kazuhiko. 1994. "Introduction: Globalization and US - Japan Relations", *American Studies International*, 32, April 1994.
- Ricklefs, M.C. M.C. 1981. *A history of Modern Indonesia since ca. 1300*. London: Macmillan.
- Roosevelt, Nicholas. 1928. *The Restless Pacific*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Saparini, Hendri. 2013. "Indonesia and Trade Liberalization 2020", *Gatra*, Special Edition APEC Summit 2013 (2 October 2013). Pp. 80-81.
- Siddique, Sharon. 1977. "Relics of the past? A sociological study of the sultanates of Cirebon, West Java". *Dissertation of University of Bielefeld*.
- "Silk Road." 2016. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved December 2, 2016 from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silk\\_Road](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silk_Road).
- Soeroto. 1976. *Sriwijaya Menguasai Lautan*. Bandung, Jakarta: Sanggabuwana.
- "Spanish-American War." 2016. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved December 1, 2016 from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SpanishAmerican\\_War#Philippines](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SpanishAmerican_War#Philippines).
- Speech of Prime Minister of Australia on Shangri-La Dialog in Singapura, 29 May 2009*. 2009. Retrieved November 25, 2017 from <http://www.pm.gov.au/node/5128>.
- Sulistiyono, Singgih Tri. 2003. "The Java Sea Network: Patterns in the Development of Interregional Shipping and Trade in the Process of national Economic Integration, 1870s - 1970s." *Ph.D. thesis* Leiden University.
- Sulistiyono, Singgih Tri. 2008. "Historiografi Pembebasan untuk Indonesia Baru", Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar Ilmu Sejarah pada Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang 15 Maret.
- Wasino. 2007. *Dari Riset Hingga Tulisan Sejarah*. Semarang: Unnes Press.
- Wasino. 2016. "Nasionalisasi Perusahaan-Perusahaan Asing Menuju Ekonomi Bedikari." *Paramita*, 26(1): 62-71.
- Widyahartono, Bob. 2009. "The Unlovely Term 'Globalization' and its Challenge of 'Regionalization/Regionalism'". *Image Indonesia*, September 2009.
- "World Population." 2016. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved December 2, 2016 from [http://india.smashits.com/wikipedia/World\\_population#The\\_17\\_most\\_populous\\_nations](http://india.smashits.com/wikipedia/World_population#The_17_most_populous_nations).