

Turnitin Originality Report

Processed on: 20-Apr-2021 16:02 WIB
 ID: 1564520141
 Word Count: 5439
 Submitted: 1

Domestic Dimension on Indonesian Public
 Diplomacy By Iva Rachmawati

| Similarity Index | Similarity by Source |
|------------------|--|
| 6% | Internet Sources: 5% Publications: 2% Student Papers: 3% |

1% match (Internet from 07-Apr-2021)

<http://www.tjprc.org/publishpapers/2-67-1608099505-66IJMPERDOCT202066.pdf>

1% match (Internet from 13-Mar-2020)

<http://www.tjprc.org/publishpapers/2-52-1465465867-1.%20IJPSLIR%20-%20The%20Role%20of%20Citizen%20in%20Indonesian%20Public%20Diplomacy%20..pdf>

1% match (student papers from 09-May-2011)

[Submitted to Cardiff University on 2011-05-09](#)

1% match (Internet from 14-Feb-2018)

<http://www.kopertis12.or.id/2010/08/29/berita-edukasi-29-agustus-2010.html>

1% match (Internet from 30-Apr-2019)

https://waseda.repo.nii.ac.jp/index.php?action=pages_view_main&active_action=repository_action_common_download&attribute_id=20&block_id=21&file_no=1&item_id=41336&ite

< 1% match (Internet from 13-Mar-2019)

https://issuu.com/tjprc/docs/1._ijcms-the_uses_of_social_network

< 1% match (Internet from 23-Aug-2019)

https://brill.com/abstract/journals/hjd/7/4/article-p441_5.xml

< 1% match (Internet from 06-Jul-2016)

http://dk.fdv.uni-lj.si/magistrska_dela_2/pdfs/mb22_brglez-nejca.pdf

< 1% match (Internet from 13-Nov-2020)

https://moam.info/character-education-in-usa_5c12e7c4097c472c678b4575.html

< 1% match (publications)

["The New Public Diplomacy", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2005](#)

< 1% match (student papers from 28-Aug-2015)

[Submitted to Goldsmiths' College on 2015-08-28](#)

< 1% match (publications)

[Maria Cowles. "Non-state actors and false dichotomies: reviewing IR/YPE approaches to European integration", Journal of European Public Policy, 2011](#)

< 1% match (publications)

[Kadir Jun Ayhan. "The Boundaries of Public Diplomacy and Nonstate Actors: A Taxonomy of Perspectives", International Studies Perspectives, 2019](#)

< 1% match (publications)

[Katarzyna Pisarska. "The Domestic Dimension of Public Diplomacy", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2016](#)

[International Journal of Communication and Media Studies \(IJCMS\) ISSN\(P\): 2250-0014; ISSN\(E\): Applied Vol. 6, Issue 3, Jun 2016, 1-12 © TJPRC Pvt. Ltd DOMESTIC DIMENSION ON INDONESIAN PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IVARACHMAWATI Department of International Relation, Pembangunan Nasional University, Indonesia](#) Department of Political Science, GadjahMada University, Indonesia ABSTRACT Domestic dimensions have started to regain their position on public diplomacy. Their consciousness of national identity, their active role in building relation between citizen and their effort in defending particular interest or idea have pushed several governments to put them as their object/target or partner. Besides [they may act complementary to or independent from states, sometimes they even challenge the role of the state](#). Their roles grow fast in globalized world and the emergence of intermestic issues. In Indonesia-Malaysia bilateral relation, these actors seem to play important roles in coloring the relation and creating dynamic rhythm. This study examines the domestic dimension in Indonesia public diplomacy towards Malaysia. In-depth interview and conversation analysis on new media were used in order to gain certain abstraction from action processes or interactions which were held by several actors in Indonesia-Malaysia bilateral relations. The preliminary results of the research show that there are three domestic dimensions which have significant contributions in the relation. Through their background which generates certain perspectives, ideas, and actions, domestic dimensions are presented as an active subject of public diplomacy and no longer play as a passive object. Those domestic dimensions are: 1) academician and cultural actors, 2) middle class economic actors and Indonesian temporary migrant workers, 3) non government organization and the netizens. Actors with better education and knowledge about the past relation show positive ideas and actions, as well as actors who have direct people-to-people contact. In the other hand, actors with limited information will act negatively in particular issue, especially nationalism or national identities. Original Article KEYWORDS: Public Diplomacy, Bilateral Relation, Domestic Dimensions Received: Apr 21, 2016; Accepted: May 05, 2016; Published: May 07, 2016; Paper Id.: IJCMSJUN20161 INTRODUCTION Recently, domestic dimension issue is presented again in the public diplomacy debates (Ellen Huijgh: 2013, Joseph Nye: 2010, Teresa La Porte: 2012, Naren Chitty: 2007). After long debates in American public diplomacy practice, domestic dimension was removed from public diplomacy in order to evade the possibility of government's propaganda material. Domestic dimension's presence is influenced by the impacts of globalization and the progress of [communication technology](#), which enable anyone to obtain and send information or idea and to persuade each other at the same time. Their huge impact in influencing and mobilizing through communication technology become one of academician considerations to put domestic dimension as government partner in public diplomacy (Ashvin Goneshdan Jan Melissen. 2005). Unfortunately, their role hadn't have any position in public diplomacy concept.

Huijgh called it as a 'denial hurt' (Ellen Huijgh: 2013). They were only put as passive subject and didn't have any change to interpret and response intermestic phenomenon by themselves or even act independently without state present. Indonesia Public Diplomacy was formed in 2002 according to President Decree no. [119/2001 about the New Structure of Foreign Affairs](#). The "Proses BenahDiri" or "Self-Arrangement Process" was one of Hassan Wirajuda's programs, the former Foreign Minister, to increase Foreign Ministry performance and enclose domestic dimension in the new structure of Foreign Ministry by Directorate General of Information and Public Diplomacy formation. Al BusyroBasnoer, Public Diplomacy Director, said that globalization and communication technology have a massive impact on people to people contact. The different background of these people would affect in how they communicate, see phenomenon, react, and response particular issue. Basnoer said that we (Foreign Ministry) should develop a diplomacy that involves various public domestic elements (Interview with Al BusyroBasnoer, Jakarta, 7th August 2015). Meanwhile, Black September brought terrorism as the new issue to international relation. This issue affected all foreign policy in every country, including Indonesia. Wirajuda believed that Bush's policy of GWOT (Global War on Terror) and Bali Bomb 2002 indicated that terrorism issue had already reached Indonesia and it must be confronted by proper policy (HasanWirajuda, 2010:186). Wirajuda attached moderat, democratic and progressif as Indonesia's image (HasanWirajuda, 2007) then to bridging international perception and internal affairs (Umar Hadi, 2009). But unfortunately, this image became the center of all public diplomacy activities. The terrorism issue led Indonesia public diplomacy practices to give more concern on the image building. Thus the domestic dimension was put as a passive subject of public diplomacy program through various activities, i.e., IACS (Indonesia Arts and Cultural Scholarship), OSTW (Outstanding Students from the World), public lectures, the Young Ambassador, interfaith dialogue and policy breakfast. Beside the public diplomacy organized by the state, there are several activities organized by domestic actors without the state's presence. They act independently to knit the relation based on their background and interest. They use their own access and funding to carry out particular interests, informations or messages. These activities make state's relationships dynamic. Between 2007-2014, Indonesia-Malaysia relation was dominated by particular domestic dimension activities which showed negative actions. Eventhough there were several positive actions carried out by certain domestic dimension on the other side, the years of tensions distill appear. This article examines the Indonesian domestic dimensions which have influence in determining Indonesia Malaysia bilateral relation based on their background and interests in order to find the patterns that can guide to 'read' Indonesian public diplomacy in practice. This will enrich the public diplomacy concept by redefined domestic dimension and their actions in public diplomacy's practices. THEORETICAL REVIEW Public Diplomacy Generally understood, public diplomacy is a tool of the government to influence public's attitude and opinion. Tuch defines public diplomacy as ["a government's process of communication with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and policies \(Tuch, 1990:3\)](#). Government as the main actor of public diplomacy still dominates [the concept of public diplomacy](#), because the state is still the only actor who has role as the coordinator of public diplomacy implementation programs (GR. Beridge, 2010). The globalization and the progress of communication technology have brought these non-state actors to become more influential. Their strategic roles in building networks and transforming ideas have made several concepts of public diplomacy put them as the other actors in public diplomacy in addition to the state. [Signitzer and Coombs \(1992\) define public diplomacy as](#) "the way in which both government and private individuals and groups influence directly or indirectly those public attitudes and opinions which bear directly on another government's foreign policy decisions". An interesting case of non-state actors is the role of the domestic dimension. Domestic dimensions are an individual or a group of people who live in a country that have influence in the relations between countries. Domestic dimensions have broader access in information exchange and building network (Brian Hocking: 1998, Geoffrey Wiseman: 1999). Several researchers showed that these domestic non-state actors could mobilize people against MNC (Po-Chi Chen, 2012), contributed in the peace process between countries (Sajjad Malik, 2014) and became a mediator (Karolina Kupinska, 2010). Therefore, the domestic dimension began to be considered in the practice of public diplomacy although they are rarely mentioned in the concept of public diplomacy. Domestic Dimensions on Public Diplomacy Study There are three positions of the domestic dimensions in public diplomacy study (see Diagram 1). First, the domestic dimensions are treated as the target or object as well as the public abroad. As the target of public diplomacy, domestic dimensions have no chance to interpret or respond the intermestic issues. They act dependently on government's program and mostly found in North America and Asia public diplomacy practices (Ellen Huijgh, 2012: 361-362). Public diplomacy acts as government's public relation institution in order to spread foreign policy information to domestic public (A. Saefudin Ma'mun: 2009). Beside information dissemination, it holds several campaigns on the particular sensitive issues, public hearing and focus group discussion to collect public support on government's foreign policy. All the activities outside the government programs will not be seen as public diplomacy. Figure 1: Domestic Dimension on public Diplomacy Practices Second, the network between citizens from different countries which has been built by the domestic dimension gives them the strategic position in disseminating information, influencing others and mobilizing people (Brian Hocking: 1998, Geoffrey Wiseman: 1999, Ali Fisher: 2010). The Government considers that the strategic position of domestic dimensions is quite valuable as government partner in organizing public diplomacy. They possess equal position in implementing public diplomacy program except policy making. The cooperation between domestic dimensions and state becomes an important thing in "New Public Diplomacy" (Jan Melissen: 2011, Ashvin Gonesh and Jan Melissen, 2005) based on several arguments and those are: 1) domestic dimension (Gonesh used 'domestic outreach' term) can expand the quantity of the audience abroad, 2) it can help government in maintaining and controlling intermestic issues, 3) domestic outreach could help to gain public support, and 4) domestic outreach can help to build national pride and national identity (Ashvin Gonesh and Jan Melissen, 2005: 7-8). Recognition of public domestic critical attitude can be used for building trust and opening communication to particular groups abroad by the government. The cooperation between government and domestic such as civil society in building trust is called as dialogue based public diplomacy (Shaun Riordan: 2004). Even though, not all the domestic dimension can be a strategic partner for government in public diplomacy. Chitty argues that non government organization, media and civil society could be a strategic partner for the government (Naren Chitty: 2007). While Zaharna states the dialogical relationship is not based on the actors as the partner but it should be built based on the issue being confronted. Then, the state has to have capability in determining the strategic stakeholder who will be put as the main think tank in public diplomacy (RS. Zaharna: 2011). However, domestic dimension or domestic outreach is valuable investment in public diplomacy (Ellen Huijgh, 2013). Third, the globalization has given an efficacy to non-state actors or internal domestic/domestic dimension in influencing policy on relationship building between countries. Non-state actors and domestic dimension are legitimate and have an efficacy when they can obtain public support and reach their goals. Moravcsik calls it as double edge diplomacy which put domestic civil society not only as a target of public diplomacy but also as an agent of public diplomacy (Andrew Moravcsik: 1993). The cooperation of civil society between countries (trans-national alliance) can turn domestic dimension became the strategic agent who can influence international policy or a mediator between states. This domestic dimension is called as intermestic non-state actors (Teresa La Porte: 2012) and do their business independently. Nowadays, they even present not as state's tool anymore but they act independently as the major actors who [understand cultures, attitudes and behavior; in order to build and manage relationships; and influence thoughts and mobilize actions to advance their interests and values](#) (Bruce Gregory, 2011: 353). RESEARCH METHODOLOGY The method used in this research was field research which focused on action patterns and interaction in various social units or actors (Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbi: 2009). This method was chosen in order to guide researcher to acknowledge actors' norms in building their perception and form their acts related to intermestic issues. Field research enables researcher to make abstraction from actions and interaction which were formed by actor's perception. This research was conducted in Indonesia-Malaysia relation that is very dynamic. They had a very good relation but suddenly they could fall in years of tension. The [data collection was conducted by in-depth interviews](#) to several determined actors based on Chitty, La Potter and Huijgh research. Those actors are: 1) academican and cultural observer, 2) middle class economic actors and Indonesian temporary migrant workers, and 3) non government organization and netizen. Besides in-depth interview, this research used literature and documents review to build theoretical arguments. Beside data from field research, this research used data from literatures and documents. RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSIONS This research finds that the domestic dimension has a significant role in Indonesian public diplomacy (Diagram 2). They're preponderant and have wider access in shaping the form of

communication on Indonesia public diplomacy toward Malaysia. Some of them have different way in understanding issues between Indonesia and Malaysia and different way in knitting the relation. As the result, those actors bring a strained relationship due to coercive actions that have organized to achieve their interest on particular issues. The tension years prove that their activities can lead the Indonesia- Malaysia bilateral relation and cause a quite dynamic relationship. Figure 2: Indonesian Domestic Dimension on Public Diplomacy Chitty stated that not all of the domestic dimensions have the same chance in public diplomacy. They can only play their role in medium and low politics (economy, social and culture areas) but not in high politics. In this area, businesses, non-government organization and also media could play a significant role in public diplomacy (Naren Chitty, 2007). While Zaharna doesn't express which institution is the important actor of domestic dimension. She just noted that strategic stakeholder engagement based on issues being faced can be government's potential partner in public diplomacy (RS. Zaharna, 2011). So, according to both academics, issue area is important thing to identify the actors and the actions taken. Based on the bilateral issue between Indonesia and Malaysia, this research identified three important actors on Indonesian [domestic dimension of public diplomacy](#). In the medium and low politics, we can find two groups, those are: first, the academics and cultural observer/actors and second, middle economic actors and migrant workers. In the high politics issues, we can find non government organization and netizen who aggressively influence public and government in knitting the relation. Those domestic dimensions of public diplomacy turn giving effect based on the issues raised. However, political issues seem to attract more domestic interest and make them be more aware and sensitive to any ideas that flourish. This explains why Indonesia Malaysia relation seems so dynamic (Table 1). The three groups of domestic non state actors or domestic dimension indicate different ways in interpreting the phenomenon. Their backgrounds, experiences and perceptions became their references in determining actions and narrations. They set aside the state from all their activities and didn't undergo public diplomacy's program to embed the 'image'. Negotiating and communicating in their own way were their activities framed by their own interpretations of intermestic issues. They freely interpreted and responded every Indonesia-Malaysia intermestic issue based on their own experience and values. In practice, the relations conducted were not always the same as the government's programs on public diplomacy. They are not acting to embed the moderate, democratic and progressive image but they promote their own interest and background and also respond particular issues based on their perception or prior knowledge and chose certain action. Table 1: Character of Indonesian Domestic Dimension Issue Economy, social and culture Character Well informed and better direct people to people contact Actors 1. Academician and cultural observer / actors 2. Middle economic actors and migrant worker Actions International seminar, cultural exchange, language workshop, economic activities. National identity / politics Less informed and never have direct people to people contact 3. Non government organization and the Netizen Demonstration, Citizen Sweeping Threads, Cyber war / illegal web intrusion. First, academics and cultural observer/actors who regularly manage several academic meetings and art workshops or cultural festivals. The members of these activities are those who have expertise in their subject and possess better knowledge about Indonesia-Malaysia relation and history. They have worked in years producing researches in various subjects: language, migrant worker, history, education, culture etc. They usually exchange knowledge and information, understand others perspectives and opinions and also bridge the different ideas. The high people to people contact creates conducive atmospheres for each actor in understanding different values, customs and language. Several academic workshops conducted by universities were great contributions for Indonesia- Malaysia relation, besides the students exchange between both countries which was held since 1970s. The private institution, Balai Melayu, has been conducting people to people contact and bridging the cultural relation between "Negaraserumpun" since 2003. The absence of the state also means the absence of funding, but, Balai Melayu could be a good example for this situation. Balai Melayu as one of private institutions which was formed for Malay cultural preservation became a bridge for citizen in knitting relation without the state's presence. They had been keeping good relation in academics activities as well as the cultural cooperation. Even though Al Mudra did not recognize it as diplomacy activities, he had already done several of diplomacy's functions, especially in informing, preserving Indonesian culture and relationship building. He confessed that he tried to convince Malaysian students who want to visit Yogyakarta when the relation was not good enough. He was very persistent in mapping Melayu's culture, collecting the tangible and intangible Melayu's culture and promoting Melayu's culture as a unifier of Indonesia and Malaysia societies. Al Mudra who had built non state relation claimed that he never felt there was any problem between both countries since the last 12 years. He believed that the tension related to migrant workers, cultural claim and border violation were only happened because of lack of information and knowledge and were only done by small groups (Interviewed with Mahyudin Al Mudra (Balai Melayu founder), Yogyakarta 30th June 2015). What Al Mudra said was proved by the EPG's (Eminent Person Group) research finding in 2008. Musni Umar, one of the members of EPG from Indonesia, also stated the same thing as Al Mudra's opinion that the tension was happened because of the poor information and knowledge of both societies (Interview with Musni Umar (member of EPG) Jakarta 26th April 2015). Unfortunately, omission became Indonesian government's choice toward these intermestic issues. The government let the media explore all the issues without any government's explanation. The government left over the internal public consumed unverified information. The government tended to remain silent even when there was a particular group harnessed the situation (Ali Maksum dan Reevany Bustami: 2014). This situation made the Malaysian Prime Minister disappointed and asked Indonesian government to restrict the disturbing actions (-----, 2010. "PM Najib: RI Harus Tertibkan Demo atau Warga Malaysia Murka". <http://news.detik.com/read/2010/08/29/163110/1430532/10/pm-najib-> [www.tjprc.org/ri-harus-tertibkan-demo-atau-warga-malaysia-murka?](http://www.tjprc.org/ri-harus-tertibkan-demo-atau-warga-malaysia-murka?nd771104bcj) nd771104bcj. Downloaded on March 4th 2015). EPG group members were academics and practitioners who have been organizing the relationship between the two countries for a long time. Their background and network became their references in analyzing issues and situations happened. Second, domestic dimensions of public diplomacy were Indonesian migrant workers and middle class economic actors. Economic interest is the main aims of these actors. But fortunately, their direct contacts have brought them a good relation between citizens of both countries. There were 94.064 Indonesian legal migrant workers in Malaysia (Albert Bonasahat: 2012) and the amount have always increased every year. These increasing numbers of migrant workers each year showed that they're comfortable and felt save working in Malaysia. In this research's in-depth interview to several Indonesian workers in Malaysia, it is shown that they were experiencing good relation with their employers in Malaysia and getting along pretty well with locals. Even though the relations was limited because of unskilled workers' concentrated residences, these migrant workers didnot have any difficulty in managing relations. They made almost everyday phone calls to their relatives in Indonesia. Balakhrisnan's research found that this condition had been supported by the cheap telecommunication rate in Malaysia (Balambigai Balakhrisnan, 2013:243). So, even though they stayed in Malaysia, they still kept the communication with their family and this contributed to build local's perception about Malaysia's working condition. One of Indonesian migrant workers said that mostly all men in his village became migrant workers in Malaysia (In-depth interview with Indonesian migrant worker, Penang, September 2015). This situation arose because they share positive information about the working conditions in Malaysia and their improved well-being. For the skilled worker, their professional working conditions put them away from the issues between countries. The interviews made to Indonesian senior mining workers found that, they weren't too interested to read any issues between the two states. They're more interested to read the 'working contract'. As long as there is professional condition, these skilled migrant workers keep the professional relations well. Another public diplomacy's functions were conducted by citizen independently based on their works. One of the respondent was a former animation employee in Malaysia who became a partner of Malaysian Animation Company, Jutakira and VanSell. The trust grows between them has delivered not only better working cooperation but also a chance for Murwanto to bring his students to have an internship program at several animation company in Malaysia (Murwanto works also as a lecture in MMTTC, Yogyakarta). Accidentally, Murwanto creates people to people contact and builds a bridge for two countries. Murwanto said that there were intermestic issues on their daily conversations, but it won't become harsh conversation if the company had good performance (In-depth interview with Murwanto, former Indonesian migrant worker. Yogyakarta, 8th September 2015). The positive interactions between Indonesia and Malaysia citizen are simply found also between merchants in Pasar Baru Trade Center, Bandung. Rp. 5 billion per day turnover showed how good trust was made in Pasar Baru Trade Center (-----, 2010. "Omzet Pasar Baru Rp 5 Miliar Per Hari", <http://regional.kompas.com/read/2010/12/16/05565439/Omzet.Pasar.Baru.Rp.5.Miliar.Per.Hari>. Download on January 15th 2015).

These middle economic actors show that even though the tension between Indonesia-Malaysia occur, it had never affected the business activities in PasarBaru Trade Center, Bandung. The in-depth interview showed that every merchant in PasarBaru Trade Center acted as a good agent for their Malaysian counterparts. This spontaneous [diplomacy \(Sherry Lee Mueller Ph.D. dan Mark Rebstock. 2012\)](#) succeeded in maintaining the relation between citizens by exchanging information between merchant. They used Smartphone and blog to do those activities. Instead of the competitive price and good quality, the trust built by the PasarBaru Trade Center's merchant becomes the unchangeable capital. These two groups of domestic dimension share the same characteristics. They share experiences through direct contacts. Even though not all of the actors have a better education, but interestingly these direct contacts bring them better mutual understanding by sharing information, ideas and also cultures and customs. Zaharna states that tolerations, understanding and the kinship flourish when each person shares information and experiences (RS Zaharna: 2011). Political issues bring the third actors in Indonesian domestic dimension. Although Chitty said that domestic actors are not able to play a significant role in political issue, in fact Indonesian public domestic had influenced the political relation between the two countries. Through negative actions, they try to influence the government's policy and Malaysia's public perceptions on particular political issues. Performed by disruptive demonstrations, citizen sweeping threats and cyber war, these actors try to preserve what they called as national pride. The third domestic dimensions indicated the most different perspective and preferred different actions toward intermestic issues. They were NGO and the Netizen. NGO (this research using Benteng Demokrasi Indonesia / Bendera and FBR / Forum Betawi Rempug as responden) stated that nationalism was an effort to defend from actions that disregard the nation pride from other party who had stolen something belongs to their nation (i.e. intangible cultural heritage). Nationalism was seen as a patriotic action toward their own country (Interview with Adian Napitupulu (Bendera founder), Jakarta 26th April 2015). So, to defend their nation pride they legitimate themselves to do anything, including coercive actions and negative narrations in communications. Besides putting patriotism as a reason to take actions, they saw 'action' as a message and the way to communicate. From this viewpoint, provocative demonstrations organized by Bendera and FBR in front of Malaysian institution or Malaysian Embassy in Jakarta were assumed to be a message. Besides organizing provocative demonstrations, they also organized Malaysia citizen sweeping which was then stopped by the local police. They tried to negotiate through these actions and consider those actions as their messages to stop the Malaysian violation to Indonesian migrant workers or to do cultural claims. NGO tried to change Malaysian government's perception and pushed Malaysian government to apologize for several sins they made. In an interview, Napitulu confirmed that their actions were the message for Indonesia government, Malaysia government and Malaysia citizen also in order to stop Indonesian cultural claims, border claims and Indonesian migrant workers violations (Interview with Adian Napitupulu (Bendera founder), Jakarta 26th April 2015). Their actions were so annoying and compelled the Malaysian Embassy delivered a statement of objection to Indonesian government. UMNO youth showed the same reactions, they wanted Indonesian government to stop the disruptive actions. Unfortunately, those actions were based on a very limited information sources. They only used mass media for the main source without doing adequate verifications to the related institution such as Foreign Ministry, Malaysian Embassy or academics. They believed that mass media delivered trusted information and therefore, they could use it to build their prior knowledge about the related phenomenon. Luthfi Hakim claimed that it was not their obligation to dig more information and verify them because it is the government's obligation (Interview with KH. Luthfi Hakim (FBR founder), Jakarta 25th April 2015). However, Napitulu claimed that their organization has trusted information because it came from the victims/migrant worker themselves and also their friends overseas (Interview with Adian Napitupulu (Bendera founder), Jakarta 26th April 2015). Meanwhile, news media plays central roles on netizen activities in sending and receiving messages. Inappropriate dictions and impolite narrations as well as illegal intrusion to both Indonesian and Malaysian websites could be founded easily in the internet since 2007-2014. The phrase "Malingsia" and "Indon" became so sensitive because it tended to humiliate each other. Followed by satire meme which massively spread in the internet, they spur the net war seemed real. Illegal intrusion and narrative war on the internet which called as net war or cyber war (Ludiro Madu: 2008) had paralysed several of Malaysian government's or Malaysian private's websites. These activities were known as the war between e-Ganyang (Indonesia) and e-Godam (Malaysia) which dominated by "deface action". The illegal intrusion always left a trail to exhibit the identity of the intruder. And without any doubt, these intruders showed their identity to mark the actions as nationalistic one. For several academics, these defacement actions are 'part of military diplomacy'. State or separatists usually use these actions to show their ability in sabotaging or damaging in order to influence the decision makers to reconsiderate their policies related to issues being faced across the country (Ien: 2005). If it is done by groups or individuals, it can be seen as citizens' attempt to show their nationalism online (Marshall McLuhan: 1964). And as well as the NGO, these news media users used media information without making any verification. And just like the NGO, this news media users enacted patriotism as a reason for the action taken. Dominated by younger people with limited education, their actions could dominate the news media activities between Indonesia and Malaysia within a certain time because of the identity issues they raised. They put different color on how citizen manage their inter-state relation. CONCLUSIONS This research finds two points in Indonesia public diplomacy related to domestic dimension: first, the domestic non state actors or domestic dimension act independently from the state. As independent actors, they do not have the same aim as Indonesia public diplomacy which put national image as their main goals. Interestingly, what the domestic dimensions do in practice is much more related to relationship building and mutual understanding. They, who have direct contact and sharing the same knowledge and interest will develop positive relation. And they, who do not have any direct contact and bring political or identity issue tend to build negative relation. Even though the last one claim that the actions taken are part of their effort in sending particular message or to negotiate, those actions spur the negative image. This happened because those actors have different understandings and ways in managing inter-state relations. The academics, cultural observers/actors, middle economic actors and also migrant workers are in the first place and in the other place are NGO and the Netizen. They compete with each other to inform and influence the society, but unfortunately the last one got biggest attention because of the issue they bring in. In Indonesia public diplomacy, these three domestic dimensions will be the significant actors in coloring the [public diplomacy activities](#). Second, in the concept of [public diplomacy](#), the role of domestic dimension in influencing the relation between societies from different countries cannot be denied. They should be part of public diplomacy even though they act independently from the state. Communication technology and the globalization bring huge chance for them in spreading ideas, norms and also culture. However, the concept of public diplomacy should not put state as the main and the only one actor anymore. REFERENCES 1. Berridge, GR. 2010. *Diplomacy Theory and Practice* 4th ed. Plagrove Macmillan: Hampshire 2. Bob Sugeng Hadiwinata. 2007. "Transformasi Isudan Aktor di dalam Hubungan Internasional: Dari Realism hingga Konstruktifisme". In Yulius Isudan Metodologi. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu. P. Hermawan. *Transfor masi dalam Studi Hubungan Internasional Aktor*, 3. Bonasahat, Albert. 2012. "Catatan Akhir Tahun Perlindungan Pekerja Migrant". ILO: Jakarta. Triangle Project. http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---ilo-jakarta/documents/presentation/wcms_201585.pdf. Downloaded 10th September 2014. 4. Chen, Po-Chi. 2012. "Cyber Public Diplomacy as China's Smart Power Strategy in an Information Age: Case Study of Anti-Carrefour Incident in 2008". *International Journal of China Studies*. Vol. 3. No 2. August 2012. 5. Cowan, Geoffrey Cowan and Amelia Arsenault. 2008. "Moving from Monolog to Dialogue to Collaboration: The Three Layers of Public Diplomacy". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 616. Sage Publications. 6. Fisher, Ali. 2010. "Mapping the Great Beyond: Identifying Meaningful Network in Public Diplomacy. CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy. Paper 2, 20120. Los Angeles: Figueroa Press. 7. Gregory, Bruce. 2011. "American Public Diplomacy: Enduring Characteristics, Elusive Transformation". *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*. Vol. 6, no. 3/4, 2011. 351-372. 8. Gonesh, Ashvin and Jan Melissen. 2005. "Public Diplomacy: Improving Practice". Netherland: Netherlands Institute of International Relation Clingendael. 9. Ham, Peter Van. 2010. *Social Power in International Politics*. New York: Routledge. 10. Ien. 2005. "I Made Wiriyana: 'e-Ganyang' Bagian Dari Diplomasi". <http://inet.detik.com/read/2005/03/15/103846/388463/323/e-ganyang-bagian-dari-diplomasi>. Download 3th September 2015. 11. Kupinska, Karolina. 2010. *Contemporary Multitrack Diplomacy Across the Taiwan Strait*. Thesis on Ming Chuan University. Taiwan. 12. La Porte, Teresae. 2012. "The Impact of Intermestic Non State Actors on the Conceptual Framework of Public Diplomacy". *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 7 (2012) 441-458. 13. Leonard, Mark, Catherine Stead and Conrad Smewing. 2002. *Public Diplomacy*. London: The

Foreign Policy Centre. 14. Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia. 2010. "Diplomasi Indonesia 2010". http://www.kemlu.go.id/Books/Buku_Diplomasi_Indonesia_2010.pdf. Downloaded 28th November 2014. 15. Maksum, Ali and Reevany Bustami. 2014. "Ketegangan Hubungan Indonesia-Malaysia Isu Tarian Pendet". *Kajian Malaysia*. Vol. 32. No. 2. 2014. 41-72. 16. McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. "Medium is the Message". In Marshall McLuhan. *Understanding Media; The Extensions of Man*. http://web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/mcluhan_mediummessage.pdf. Download 1st September 2015. 17. Melissen, Jan. 2011. "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice". In Jan Melissen. *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan. 18. Moravcsik, Andrew. 1993. "Interacting International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining". In Peter Evans, Harold Jacobson and Robert Putnam (ed). *Double Edged Diplomacy*. Berkeley: California Press. 19. Madu, Ludiro. 2008. "AmbalatNetwar antara Indonesia-Malaysia, 2005: Refleksi Teoritis Mengenai Hubungan Internasional di Era Internet", *Global & Strategis*, Th. II, No. 1, Januari - Juni 2008. 20. Malik, Sajjad. 2014. "Track II Diplomacy and Its Impact on Pakistan India Peace Process". http://issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/1339998912_67212139.pdf 21. Mueller, Sherry Lee Ph.D. dan Mark Rebstock. 2012. "The Impact and Practice of Citizen Diplomacy". *PD Magazines Issue 7 Winter 2012*. USC Annenberg Press. 22. Nakamura, Kennon H. and Matthew C. Weed. 2009. "U.S. Public Diplomacy: Background and Current Issues". Congressional Research Service: CRS Report for Congress. 7-5700. www.crs.gov. Downloaded 12th Juni 2014. 23. Nau, Henry R. 2009. *Perspective on International Relations, Power, Institution, Ideas* 2nd. Washington: CQ Press. 24. Nye, Joseph. 2010. "The Essential New Public Diplomacy in Modern Power Politics". <http://bataviase.co.id>. Downloaded 10th Desember 2014. 25. Riordan, Shaun. 2004. "Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy Paradigm". Discussion Papers in Diplomacy. No. 4. November 2004. Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'. 26. Signitzer, Benno and Timothy Coombs. 1992. "Public Relations and Public Diplomacy: Conceptual Divergence". *Public Relations Review* 18 (2): 137-47. 27. Steans, Jill and Lyod Pettiford. 2009. *Hubungan Internasional Perspektif dan Tema*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. 28. Strauss, Anselms and Juliet Corbin. 2009. "Metodologi Grounded Theory Ulasan Singkat". In Norman K. Denzin dan Yvonna S. Lincoln. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. 29. Tuch, Hans. 1990. *Communicating with the World: US Public Diplomacy Overseas*. New York: St. Martin's. 30. Wirajuda, Hassan. 2010. "Kedekatan Alamiah antara PR dan Diplomasi". In Silih Agung Wasesadan Jim Macnamara. *Strategi Public Relation*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Utama. 31. Zaharna, RS. 2000. "Intercultural Communication and International Public Relation: Exploring Parallels". *Communication Quarterly* Vol. 48. No. 1. Winter 32. Zaharna, RS. 2011. "The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement". *International Studies Association Conference*, Montreal, March 15-19, 2011. 33. "Bendera dan FBR Siap Sweeping Warga Malaysia". 2010. <http://metro.news.viva.co.id/news/read/174461-massa-bendera-sweeping-bank-niaga-dan-proton>. Downloaded 15th Januari 2015. 2010. "Omzet Pasar Baru Rp 5 Miliar Per Hari", <http://regional.kompas.com/read/2010/12/16/05565439/Omzet.Pasar.Baru.Rp.5.Miliar.Per.Hari>. Downloaded 15th Januari 2015. 2010. "PM Najib: RI Harus Tertibkan Demo atau Warga Malaysia Murka". <http://news.detik.com/read/2010/08/29/163110/1430532/10/pm-najib-ri-harus-tertibkan-demo-atau-warga-malaysia-murka>. Downloaded 4th Maret 2015. 2 Iva Rachmawati Domestic Dimension on Indonesian Public Diplomacy 3 4 Iva Rachmawati Domestic Dimension on Indonesian Public Diplomacy 5 6 Iva Rachmawati Domestic Dimension on Indonesian Public Diplomacy 7 8 Iva Rachmawati Domestic Dimension on Indonesian Public Diplomacy 9 10 Iva Rachmawati Domestic Dimension on Indonesian Public Diplomacy 11 www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org