SOCIAL POLITICS AND HUMANITIES
Jurnal sosial politik dan humaniora
Vol. 1, No. 1

COOPERATION BETWEEN MEXICO, INDONESIA, SOUTH KOREA, TURKEY AND AUSTRALIA (M.I.K.T.A.): MAXIMIZE THE BENEFITS FOR INDONESIA IN 2022-2023

Kevin Dio Kusuma Putra[1*]
[1]Universitas Jakarta
[1]Jl. Pulomas Barat No.Raya, RT.3/RW.10, Kayu Putih, Kec. Pulo Gadung, Kota Jakarta Timur, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 13210

Email: Kevindio@gmail.com[1]

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history:
Received
28 Agustus 2024
Revided
03 September 2024
Accepted
05 September 2024

Keywords: Economic Cooperation, Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Türkiye, Australia

Abstract
In the development of the globalization era, every country needs other countries to develop its economy. One of the things that countries in the world do is to cooperate. This is evidenced by the cooperation between Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey and Australia in M.I.K.T.A. The study aims to provide knowledge about the cooperation carried out by the five countries in improving each other's economies. In addition, the author wants to know how much M.I.K.T.A.'s contribution is to the economy in Indonesia. The method used is qualitative, with a narrative and analytical descriptive approach. This study explains how the cooperation of Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey and Australia creates an economic climate that benefits each other. In addition, the cooperation carried out by several countries can lift the economy of lagging countries from their slump. Therefore, cooperation between several countries is essential for developing the world economy.

INTRODUCTION

The increase in the flow of globalization is the initial capital to encourage changes in the world order. Countries must carry out their various political, economic, social, and cultural conveniences. A borderless world, one of the impacts of globalization, is a means for these countries to increase their interaction, including in economic cooperation activities, especially trade, exports, imports, etc. Indonesia is one of the countries that feel these benefits; in other words, it feels the convenience of carrying out economic and trade activities with each other. In general, Indonesia is a country with many islands. In other words, it is also called the largest archipelagic country. In addition, Indonesia is also known as the fifth most populous country in the world; this number of islands in Indonesia evidences this with a total of 17,508 islands of wh, ich around 6,000 islands are inhabited. On the other hand, in 2021, Indonesia also had a population of around 273.8 million people based on data released by the U.N. This figure makes Indonesia the fourth largest country in the world today (Recipe, 2015).Indonesia is trying to raise its level to become a developed country.

Of course, to raise the class, Indonesia must address several problems and needs. The development of increasingly dynamic international issues has real implications for the foreign policy decision-making of each country, especially Indonesia. On the other hand, at this time, the developing issues are not only focused on traditional issues, such as ideological conflicts and wars but have now spread to non-traditional issues. Non-traditional issues began to emerge in the late 1990s, the emergence of which was marked, for example, by the emergence of environmental problems, human rights violations, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, democracy, socio-culture, trade, and so on that could threaten national and international security and stability.

This happens because state actors and non-state actors carry out an interaction process. Seeing the increasingly complex challenges for the international world, especially in the economic sector, forces countries to find ways to face these challenges. One of them is cooperation in the trade economy, both bilaterally and multilaterally. The integration of multilateral cooperation is necessary to face various problems and needs in this world. One form of integration or multilateral cooperation is the formation of multilateral cooperation between Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey, and Australia, abbreviated as M.I.K.T.A. On 25 September 2013, on the sidelines of the 67th U.N. General Assembly, the foreign ministers of Mexico, Indonesia, Korea, Turkey, and Australia met to discuss forming an informal consultative group. Through M.I.K.T.A., Indonesia can explore more benefits than through bilateral channels in cooperating with Korea, Turkey, Australia, and Mexico. It could also be done by taking a multilateral route to cooperate. If this can be done, Indonesia can realize what was written by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Retno Marsudi, together with the Foreign Ministers of Mexico, Korea, Turkey, and Australia: "21st Century Global Governance: Rise of the Rest".

In a special meeting with M.I.K.T.A. journalists, including Liputan 6 S.C.T.V. journalist Raymond Kaya in Canberra, Julie Bishop (Kaya, 2015) emphasized the beauty of M.I.K.T.A. is the informal and flexible relationship between its member countries. Bishop said this is understandable because each country has international economic and political problems with countries in its region, such as Turkey with Europe, Mexico with the United States, Indonesia with ASEAN, and South Korea with its neighbours the P.R.C. and North Korea. Historically, M.I.K.T.A. was formed on 25 September 2013, on the sidelines of the 67th U.N. General Assembly; the Foreign Ministers of Mexico, Indonesia, Korea, Turkey, and Australia met to discuss forming an informal and flexible consultative group. M.I.K.T.A. is also considered a collection of middle-power countries with several agendas for the interests of the international world amid changes in the international political constellation marked by the shadow of

competition between the status quo (G-7) and emerging powers, which are members of BRICS. BRICS is one form of cooperation that includes extensive economic integration, namely Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, which are brought together in the G-20. Several G-20 countries outside the two blocks formed M.I.K.T.A. M.I.K.T.A., declared in September 2013, is expected to provide space for creating global governance that does not only pay attention to the interests of the big countries (superpowers). Since its establishment in 2013, M.I.K.T.A., which aspires to become a bridge builder and agenda-setter in the global order, has changed. M.I.K.T.A. has grown from humble beginnings to several frameworks, meetings, projects, and outreach. M.I.K.T.A. has become a place to share ideas and experiences and a forum to find innovative strategies and breakthroughs in managing global order.

Furthermore, through M.I.K.T.A., the five-member countries collaboratively try to overcome many of the problems currently facing the international community. In 2021, Indonesia devoted its best efforts to the task of our M.I.K.T.A. colleagues entrusted to coordinate the M.I.K.T.A. Event with the theme "Growing Creative Economy and Contributing to Global Peace." This theme is very relevant to the current context. A creative economy is a way to create jobs, sustain development, and develop technology amidst the global economic slowdown. The M.I.K.T.A. chair also discussed innovative and multidimensional ways to create peace and resolve conflicts; in addition, during his tenure as chair, Indonesia aims to take the initiative to contribute to shaping the future direction of M.I.K.T.A. by looking at the current situation of M.I.K.T.A., how M.I.K.T.A. should be used and the types of operational mechanisms M.I.K.T.A. should pursue to enhance its meaning and presence.

METODE

The type of research used in this study is descriptive. Descriptive research tends to use analysis. In descriptive research, the research process is also more displayed using the theoretical basis. The theory is used as a guide to focus on research based on facts in the field. Descriptive research obtains primary data from interviews and observations at the research location. Furthermore, researchers will analyze the data obtained from the research to produce new concepts or theories. This happens if the results of the research being studied contradict the theory that has been used by researchers in their research activities. Descriptive research aims to create a systematic, factual, and accurate description of the facts and characteristics of a particular population or area. Descriptive research can provide a more detailed picture of a symptom or phenomenon as a continuation of exploratory research. They use the question "HOW" when developing information.

The form of research is closely related to the distance between the researcher and the object being studied. The research method used in this study is library research. Library research is a theoretical study, references and other scientific literature related to culture, values and norms that develop in the social situation being studied (Sugiyono: 2012). In library research, researchers observe research objects through library materials. Researchers limit the research time in this study, namely from 2022 to 2023. This is used to make this research more focused. Researchers took this research time because Indonesia was the Chair of the M.I.K.T.A. partnership cooperation at that time. This study will use deductive data analysis techniques, where the author searches for data from various data sources and then collects it. After collecting all the data, the author selects some necessary data. Furthermore, the data is analyzed to support the arguments put forward by the author regarding Indonesia's foreign policy towards the M.I.K.T.A. partnership cooperation in 2022 - 2023.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Previously, Indonesia's foreign policy was discussed in the international cooperation forum, and then M.I.K.T.A. was discussed as an international cooperation forum for developing countries. Furthermore, this chapter will discuss the interests and achievements obtained by Indonesia in joining as one of the M.I.K.T.A. member countries based on the interests that Indonesia wants to achieve (Putra, 2019). In the era of globalization like today, world problems and challenges are increasingly complex. Various problems arise, ranging from economic problems to terrorism, human trafficking, conflict, politics, etc. Then, the world's challenges are getting higher; developing countries like Indonesia are in the shadow of superpowers in the foreign policy game and global governance. Indonesia's joining M.I.K.T.A. certainly brings various interests ranging from economic and political to defence and security (Putra, 2019).

As previously explained, Indonesia joined M.I.K.T.A. in 2013 with Mexico, Korea, Turkey, and Australia. Indonesia itself hopes to address the seven core M.I.K.T.A. priorities through cross-sectoral initiatives with a particular focus on the economy and trade of the creative economy, countering terrorism and global security, and peacekeeping. Indonesia believes achieving economic progress that helps maintain peace and stability is more important than ever. Regarding the seven core priorities, Indonesia has several strong points to share with other M.I.K.T.A. member countries (Putra, 2019). Indonesia will also seek to strategically connect political and economic interests between developed and developing countries within M.I.K.T.A. and externally to form and maintain a more equitable global governance. Indonesia's joining as one of the M.I.K.T.A. countries is an extension of Indonesia's need to achieve the national interests that Indonesia wants to achieve. M.I.K.T.A. itself was formed to fight for common interests to strengthen multilateralism, support an effective global governance structure, and provide support for global stability and prosperity from the national interests of a country being able to produce various policies, policies issued by a country, both domestically and abroad, generally aim to realize the ideals/ideologies held and desired by a country. National interests drive actors to interact with other actors (Putra, 2019).

National interests are several goals of a country that are narrowed down to broader interests to increase and protect the power of a country. Each country has several national interests, and a country must emphasize and pay attention to one national interest and postpone other interests. This choice is decided based on instructions from the country's national interests. Indonesia joined as one of the countries in the M.I.K.T.A. international cooperation forum (Mexico, Indonesia, Korea, Turkey, and Australia) to achieve national interests (Putra, 2019). The initial M.I.K.T.A. meeting on the sidelines of the 67th U.N. General Assembly was not without purpose. On the contrary, the location of the meeting was intended for the five M.I.K.T.A. member countries to signal that M.I.K.T.A. could play an active diplomatic role that influenced the decision-making process at the global level in the U.N. (Putra, 2019). This is also closely related to the final negotiations of the climate change agreement at the UNFCCC COP 21 in Paris at the end of this year, which is also a strategic point for Indonesia to fight for the climate change agenda at the global level. The momentum of positive signals in climate change negotiations, along with the signing of a memorandum of understanding (M.O.U.) between the U.S. and China last year, is an opportunity for Indonesia to complete climate change negotiations smoothly. In particular, Indonesia can play a central role, just as Indonesia succeeded in becoming a bridge between the G-77 countries (developing countries) and the G-7 (developed countries) in the UNFCCC COP 13 in Bali (Putra, 2019).

The presence of each country in M.I.K.T.A. not only represents the entity of one country but, more broadly, the region of each strategic M.I.K.T.A. member country. This strategic meaning is also closely related to the fact that M.I.K.T.A. countries have the same concerns regarding climate change. Therefore, this can be Indonesia's initial capital to play diplomacy to

unite the voices between developing and developed countries to make the C.O.P. 21 U.N.F.C.C.C. climate change negotiations successful (Choiruzzad, 2016). Then, Indonesia's other leadership in M.I.K.T.A. was carried out by Indonesia to expand its foreign policy influence. Indonesia and other M.I.K.T.A. member countries can strengthen each other to support economic development and participate in global governance reform in various ways (Putra, 2019). First, Indonesia can try to convince M.I.K.T.A. member countries to support Indonesia's candidacy as a non-permanent member of the U.N. Security Council from 2019 to 2020. At the global level, Indonesia can be a strategic liaison for political and economic interests between developed and developing countries. to promote a more equal and just global governance.

Meanwhile, at the regional level, Indonesia's presence in the M.I.K.T.A. can expand the regional network connecting ASEAN and other M.I.K.T.A. countries, which can contribute to the growing regional architecture in the Asia-Pacific and Indian Ocean region (Indo-Pacific region). This situation strengthens inter-regional relations between ASEAN and the regions where other M.I.K.T.A. countries are located, for example, in the Mediterranean, America, and Oceania). This cooperation can support ASEAN's regional integration (Putra, 2019). In the M.I.K.T.A. Goes to Campus activity held at Hasanudin University Makassar, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs created the M.I.K.T.A. Goes To Campus program to introduce and socialize M.I.K.T.A. among young people and students, M.I.K.T.A. Goes To Campus III which raised the theme "Fostering Creative Economy and Contributing to Global Peace" presented ambassadors and heads of embassies of member countries, namely the Mexican Ambassador to Indonesia Armando Gonzalo Alvarez Reina, Head of Deputy Mission of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta Mr. Allaster Cox, Consular of the Embassy of the Republic of South Korea in Jakarta. Also present were representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Muhsin Syihab, as part of the Directorate of Economic and Environmental Development. According to Muhsin Syihab, M.I.K.T.A., under the chairmanship of Indonesia, is trying to make various innovations. One is encouraging the development of the digital economy or start-up businesses in M.I.K.T.A. member countries. "For example, we recently held a start-up business festival (Putra, 2019). We invited start-up entrepreneurs from M.I.K.T.A. countries, including Indonesia, to the festival. The program was very successful because it could bring together hundreds of start-up entrepreneurs (Rauf, 2018).

The innovative program carried out by Indonesia is significant in bringing M.I.K.T.A. citizens and communities together. The partnerships built are carried out by official representatives of the country, people, and business-to-business contacts (Putra, 2019). This activity is expected to socialize M.I.K.T.A. for the wider community further and optimize Indonesia's role in M.I.K.T.A. in particular. It is one of Indonesia's efforts to expand and demonstrate its foreign policy influence on global agendas. This year, Indonesia will hold the M.I.K.T.A. to support efforts to develop the creative economy sector. Experts Meeting on Inclusive Digital Economy Accelerator Hub, M.I.K.T.A. Start Up Fest, and M.I.K.T.A. Side Event on Creative Economy on the sidelines of the W.C.C.E. meeting in November 2018. (M, 2018) In addition, to develop cooperation in countering terrorism, this year, Indonesia will also hold the M.I.K.T.A. Workshop on Counter Terrorism and Deradicalization and M.I.K.T.A. Interfaith and Intercultural Dialogue (Putra, 2019). Expanding Indonesia's Influence in the International World Through Non-MIKTA In addition to expanding its influence within M.I.K.T.A., Indonesia also expands and demonstrates its foreign policy influence in other global agendas such as, for example, fighting for Indonesia's role in multilateral groups, such as the East Asia Summit (E.A.S.), G20, U.N. or Organization of Islamic Cooperation (O.I.C.), clearly seen as a success. President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono emphasized Indonesia's Islamic and democratic credentials (Putra, 2019).

By showing interest in matters concerning the Muslim world - for example, the Israeli-Palestinian peace process or the Rohingya Muslim situation in Myanmar - Yudhoyono managed to express Indonesia's solidarity with Muslim countries. Despite the country's limited influence in this regard, Yudhoyono also started the so-called Bali Democracy Forum (B.D.F.), a government initiative established in 2008, allowing Indonesia to share its democratization experiences with other Muslim countries and vice versa. Even though the B.D.F. lacks a proper decision-making body and has been criticized as another talking shop, this initiative demonstrates Indonesia's desire to become a more prominent player in world affairs. (Ricklefs, 1993)

Organizations such as ASEAN, the East Asia Summit (E.A.S.) or the Bali Democracy Forum established by Yudhoyono in 2008 are seen as key players in fostering peace and cooperation. Furthermore, from an economic perspective, the cohesion of the Southeast Asian region is also essential for Indonesia. Maintaining stability and a rules-based global order, where Indonesia can be more actively involved in international affairs, is also one of the country's most important interests. Playing a more active role in global organizations, such as the U.N., G20, or the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (O.I.C.), will help to preserve an international order that restrains aggression by states against each other and can effectively manage other risks and threats such as terrorism, state fragility and failure, intra-state conflicts, and the security impacts of climate change and resource scarcity (Fenyő Márton, 2015). The term ‘global policy broker’ is developed from the concept of ‘policy broker’ in public policy literature, particularly in the Advocacy Coalition Framework tradition (Sabatier, 1988). If we consider international relations to be taking place within a society of states, as in the English School tradition, we can see global governance as ‘global public policy.’ Although states are the main actors in international relations, they are not simply a ‘system.’ each party’s behaviour is an essential factor in the calculations of the other party. States are part of an international society that provides standard rules and institutions for interaction (Bull & Watson, 1984; Buzan, 1993). In this framework, states in international society can be analogous to citizens in domestic societies (Barkin, 2006). Thus, similar to the idea that laws and regulations at the domestic level are outputs of the public policy process, we can argue that global governance is also an output of the public policy process at the international level, which is primarily shaped by coalitions of states (Choiruzzad, 2018).

In the Advocacy Coalition Framework, public policy is shaped by the outcome of contestation between advocacy coalitions. These coalitions are formed by individuals who share core beliefs about the causes eff, effects, and values of public policy. As Sabatier (1988) observed, in the public policy process, people from different backgrounds, including elected officials and institutions, interest group leaders, researchers, and the general public, form specific belief systems (sets of core values, causal assumptions, and problem perceptions) and provide significant examples of coordinated activity over time (Sabatier, 1988; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993). Despite the diversity of backgrounds, diverse members can coordinate effectively because they share core policy beliefs (Choiruzzad, 2018). According to this framework, coalitions are organized based on agreement on core beliefs about policy (Cerna, 2013). Although initially used to understand the public policy process at the domestic level, we can also apply this framework at the international level. The contestation of various advocacy coalitions on different issues shapes global governance. For example, competing ‘global advocacy coalitions’ in the World Trade Organization led to the deadlock in the Doha Round. There are also advocacy coalitions within the U.N. (on the issue of U.N.S.C. reform) and in the G-20 (BRICS vs G7). We can understand that it is more appropriate to see the groups of countries in conflict as 'global advocacy coalitions' rather than in relatively fixed categories such as 'developed/developing countries' or in Huntington's 'civilizations' that developed or developing countries take a cspecificposition in the WTO debate not because they are

categorized as developing countries, but because they believe in 'global policy beliefs'. Therefore, dialogue and negotiation are essential because

Similar things also happen at the regional level, such as in the ASEAN region. Although its power is limited compared to the U.S., China, and Japan, which are also active and have interests in regional politics in East Asia, ASEAN can influence the direction of East Asia's regional architecture by initiating and institutionalizing norm-based mechanisms and practices in East Asian regional forums (Haacke, 1998; Caballero-Anthony, 2014). Mely Caballero-Anthony argues that the ability to strengthen this ability comes from "ASEAN's structural position...as a key node in its efforts to be widely connected and embedded in network density" (Caballero-Anthony, 2014). ASEAN could be more robust in terms of ability. However, ASEAN makes up for this weakness by being able to position itself as a bridge to help manage competition and cooperation between large countries in the region. On a global scale, M.I.K.T.A. can play this role in shaping and strengthening global governance. M.I.K.T.A. countries are a link or hub in global governance. They connect developing and developed countries. They are very active and influential in their respective regions. They also represent different cultural and civilizational backgrounds. They connect North and South and East and West. It is a group like no other. M.I.K.T.A. can also serve as a bridge connecting the G-20 multilateralism with those outside the mechanism. In order to effectively deal with the global financial crisis, it had to limit its membership rather than rely on universal multilateralism. In this regard, the G-20 multilateralism was relatively successful in coordinating measures to prevent a global depression and maintain global capital flows (Hampson & Heinbecker, 2011).

However, this effectiveness came at the expense of the legitimacy of multilateralism. For many, the G-20 is a “self-appointed group” that undermined post-World War II multilateralism (Spiegel, 2010). In this context, M.I.K.T.A. can help bridge the effective but exclusive G-20 with a larger audience through their positions as influential actors in their respective regions. They can speak for “universal multilateralism” through their presence in the G-20 (Choiruzzad, 2018).

M.I.K.T.A. policy documents show its strength lies in its position as a ‘connector’ or ‘hub’ in complex global governance. M.I.K.T.A.’s Vision Statement is replete with terms such as “cross-regional platform,” “playing a bridging role between developed and developing countries,” or “reducing the gap in polarized policy positions.” However, this recognition must be translated into a more explicit self-concept that directs M.I.K.T.A.’s initiatives. To do this, I propose that M.I.K.T.A. conceptualize itself as a ‘Global Policy Broker’ (Choiruzzad, 2018). Having argued that Indonesia tends to differentiate itself in localizing “foreign” norms, this section will outline Indonesia’s role in international peacekeeping operations. In this regard, the main issue is Indonesia’s role in filling the gap in norms in international peacekeeping operations without ignoring the need to increase Indonesia’s participation in international peacekeeping operations. Both aspects are essential for Indonesia as a middle-power country, especially during its leadership in M.I.K.T.A. in 2018.

The latter aspect is essential because it will provide Indonesia with experience benefits, while the first aspect is equally important as a normative basis for Indonesian activism in peacekeeping operations. Indonesia has a long history in peacekeeping operations since the 1950s, during the Suez Canal Crisis in 1957. Until September 2017, Indonesia has contributed to more than 28 U.N. Peacekeeping Operations (U.N.P.K.O.) by providing more than 38,000 military and police troops. At the end of 2017, the total personnel deployed by Indonesia amounted to 2,700 personnel in 9 U.N.P.K.O. missions. (Sriyanto, 2018). Indonesia has programmed an increase in its personnel under U.N.P.K.O. through “Vision 4,000” in 2019. This program will place Indonesia among the top ten contributing countries to U.N.P.K.O. The program is realized through one of the supporting programs for developing the Indonesian

Peace and Security Center in Sentul, West Java. This centre is Southeast Asia's largest facilitation centre, showing Indonesia's readiness to contribute to world peace. (Sriyanto, 2018).

Since Indonesia started its diplomatic focus on the peacekeeping summit in 2015, next year should support Indonesia’s interests from various middle power experiences in peacekeeping operations. Indonesia’s leadership in 2018 is expected to increase the capacity of Indonesia’s peacekeeping diplomacy network (Sriyanto, 2018). In addition to facts and expectations, the central important aspect that needs to be addressed is domestic coordination in peacekeeping operations. Since most of its operations are related to civil and military aspects, they require equal attention and improvement. Indonesia has increased its military capabilities to support current U.N.P.K.O. needs, especially regarding material capabilities and personnel capacity. However, Indonesia must intelligently pay attention to how to disseminate and collect experiences through its bridge-building role. This consideration is related to the intermestic aspect of peacekeeping operations because it will increase the morale of the domestic population and provide practical lessons for Indonesian P.K.O. personnel. However, this should be considered a blowback or overstretch impact due to miscalculating its benefits. There are pros and cons, and appropriate measurement instruments and narratives are needed. So far, the main narrative of Indonesia's current diplomacy, "democracy, a Muslim-populated country, and pluralism," should be the basis for measuring Indonesia's peacekeeping operations (Sriyanto, 2018).

CONCLUSION

Indonesia is one of the countries that feel these benefits; in other words, it feels the convenience of carrying out economic activities and trading with each other. In general, Indonesia is a country with many islands. In other words, it is also called the largest archipelagic country. As a developing country, Indonesia is trying to raise its level to become a developed country. Of course, to raise the class, Indonesia must address several problems and needs. The development of increasingly dynamic international issues has real implications for the foreign policy decision-making of each country, especially Indonesia.

On the other hand, at this time, the developing issues are not only focused on traditional issues, such as ideological conflicts and wars but have now spread to non-traditional issues. Non-traditional issues began to emerge in the late 1990s, the emergence of which was marked, for example, by the emergence of environmental problems, human rights violations, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, democracy, socio-culture, trade, and so on that could threaten national and international security and stability. This happened because of the interaction process that was carried out not only by state actors but also by non-state actors. Seeing the challenges of the increasingly complex international world, especially in the economic sector, forced countries to find ways to face these challenges. One is cooperation in the field of economic trade, both bilaterally and multilaterally. The integration of multilateral cooperation is very much needed to face various problems and needs in this world. One form of integration or multilateral cooperation is the formation of multilateral cooperation between Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey, and Australia, abbreviated as M.I.K.T.A. On 25 September 2013, on the sidelines of the 67th U.N. General Assembly, the foreign ministers of Mexico, Indonesia, Korea, Turkey, and Australia met to discuss establishing an informal consultative group, M.I.K.T.A.

M.I.K.T.A. is a group of middle-class countries with an agenda related to global issues. Amidst global changes marked by competition between the status quo powers (G-7) and emerging powers (BRICS), BRICS is the integration of the major economies of Brazil, Russia, India, China (Tigris), and South Africa. Since its founding in 2013, M.I.K.T.A. has sought to be a bridge and agenda setter in changing the world order. From its humble beginnings, M.I.K.T.A. has grown to encompass various frameworks, conferences, projects, and advocacy

efforts. M.I.K.T.A. is not only a forum for exchanging ideas and experiences but also a forum for finding innovative strategies and breakthroughs in organizing the world order. Furthermore, through M.I.K.T.A., the five-member countries seek to jointly address many of the problems currently facing the international community.

Since its founding in 2013, M.I.K.T.A. aspires to be a bridge builder and agenda-setter in the global order. M.I.K.T.A. has grown from humble beginnings to several frameworks, meetings, projects, and outreaches. M.I.K.T.A. has become a place to share ideas and experiences and a forum to find innovative and breakthrough strategies for managing global order. Furthermore, through M.I.K.T.A., the five-member countries collaboratively try to address many of the problems currently facing the international community. Although M.I.K.T.A. does not yet have a formal status, the members of this group serve as bridges in several policy areas, especially between developed and developing countries; rather than being threats, they address global issues and act as representatives of their region or similar countries. Although M.I.K.T.A. members differ significantly from each other in terms of history, context, demands, potential and future, there is a remarkable commonality within this diverse group. They can still hold similar views that underline their standard features. Their political and diplomatic will and shared view that collaborating with other like-minded countries is the best way to defend their interests and influence global issues is essential to improving their posture. The five M.I.K.T.A. countries come from diverse cultures and regions. However, we share core values and commonalities. We are democracies benefiting from open economies with strong growth rates and significant economic power. We are strategically located and closely linked to our surrounding regions in all aspects.

M.I.K.T.A. countries are also like-minded on many of today's global challenges and are active contributors to major international forums. We have the will and ability to contribute to protecting public goods and strengthening global governance. Working together, M.I.K.T.A. can play a constructive role in the international agenda and exert greater influence. We reaffirm our commitment to the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and other universally recognized norms governing international relations.

There are several reasons why Indonesia attaches great importance to M.I.K.T.A. and why M.I.K.T.A. is relevant to today's international relations:

- First, although relations and cooperation between countries in recent decades have been mainly shaped by bilateralism, regionalism, inter-regionalism, and multilateralism, the founding of M.I.K.T.A. has incorporated cross-regionalism as an innovative format for multi-country cooperation.
- Second, although M.I.K.T.A. focuses on facilitating pragmatic and creative solutions to regional and global challenges through programmed activities, M.I.K.T.A. has a clear and strategic direction and guiding principles as stated in the M.I.K.T.A. Vision Statement 2015.
- Third, although this platform is still informal, M.I.K.T.A. has adopted a methodology that guides the organization in conducting meetings, communicating, and building alignment.
- Fourth, although M.I.K.T.A. member countries come from diverse cultures and regions, so they have their own uniqueness, they also share the same thinking in facing many of the current global challenges and in their strong commitment to helping resolve them.

About the seven main priorities, Indonesia has several advantages that can be equated with other M.I.K.T.A. member countries. For example, Indonesia continues to make significant progress in the creative economy sector—which is based on culture and technology. In the field of global security, Indonesia's approach to countering terrorism, which takes into account democratic values, fundamental freedoms and protection of human rights, as well as preventive measures, has attracted the attention of many parties, including M.I.K.T.A. member countries.

The country's deradicalization, rehabilitation, reconciliation and reintegration programs have yielded results. Moreover, inter- and intra-religious dialogue continues to be an essential pillar in the effort to eradicate terrorism. The M.I.K.T.A. platform allows Indonesia to share lessons learned and best practices in this priority area. In the field of peacekeeping, Indonesia has a long-standing role and contribution. Indonesia is one of the oldest countries contributing to U.N. peacekeeping operations, and it has participated in U.N. peacekeeping missions since the First UN Emergency Force (UNEF I) in the Middle East in 1956

REFERENCE

Chapnick, Adam. "The Middle Power." Canadian Foreign Policy Journal 7, no. 2 (1999): pp. 73-82, https://doi.org/10.1080/11926422.1999.9673212.

Cooper, Andrew F. 2015. "MIKTA And The Global Projection Of Middle Powers: Toward A Summit Of Their Own?". Global Summitry 1 (1): 95-114. Doi:10.1093/global/guv005.

Cooper, Andrew F. "Testing Middle Power's Collective Action in a World of Diffuse Power." International Journal 71, no. 4 (2016): 529-44. Accessed May 12, 2020. Doi:10.2307/26414056.

Cooper, Andrew F., and Emel Parlar Dal. "Positioning the Third Wave of Middle Power Diplomacy: Institutional Elevation, Practice Limitations." International Journal 71, no.4 (2016): 516-28. Accessed May 13, 2020. Doi: 10.2307/26414055.

Gurtov, Mel. "South Korea's Foreign Policy and Future Security: Implications of the Nuclear Standoff." Pacific Affairs 69, no. 1 (1996): 8-31. Doi: 10.2307/2760871.

Han, Sung-Joo. Changing Values in Asia: Their Impact on Governance and Development. Singapore: ISEAS, 2000.

Lee, Chae-Jin. "The Direction of South Korea's Foreign Policy." Korean Studies 2 (1978): 95-137. www.jstor.org/stable/23717717.

Mo, Jongryn. 2016. "South Korea's Middle Power Diplomacy: A Case of Growing Compatibility between Regional and Global Roles". International Journal: Canada's

Journal of Global Policy Analysis 71 (4): 587-607. Doi: 10.1177/0020702016686380. O'Neil, Andrew. South Korea as a Middle Power: Global Ambitions and Looming Challenges. Council on Foreign Relations Press. 2015.

Pekkanen, Saadia, John Ravenhill, Rosemary Foot, Scott A. Snyder, and Leif-Eric Easley. "South Korea's Foreign Relations and Security Policies." The Oxford Handbook of the International Relations of Asia, January 2014. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199916245.013.0023.

Pattiwaellapia, Joesevien Nur Andini. “Kepentingan Nasional Korea Selatan sebagai Negara Middle Power dalam Pembentukan Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey and Australia (MIKTA) di Tahun 2013.” Thesis. Universitas Brawijaya (2017). http://repository.ub.ac.id/id/eprint/8726.Keterlibatan Korea Selatan Dalam MIKTA Guna Menunjang Status Sebagai Sebuah Middle Power ELFARA KHAIRUNNISA,

Dr. Randy Wirasta Nandyatama Universitas Gadjah Mada, 2020 | Diunduh dari http://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/45

Shin-wha, Lee and Chun Young Park. "Korea's Middle Power Diplomacy for Human Security: A Global and Regional Approach." Journal of International and Area Studies 24, no. 1 (2017): 21-44. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44272878.

Snyder, Scott A. “8. The Paradox of South Korea’s Middle-Power Status.” South Korea at the Crossroads, 2018, 192–211. https://doi.org/10.7312/snyd18548-010.

Young Jong, Choi. "South Korea's Regional Strategy and Middle Power Activism." The Journal of East Asian Affairs 23, no. 1 (2009): 47-67. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23257990