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INTRODUCTION

Through diplomatic relations spanning more than 60 years, New Zealand’s Prime Minister Helen Clark stated in 2005 that Indonesia’s political dynamics offered hope for renewing the country’s potential future (Wilson, 2012). Frank Wilson corroborated that the bilateral relationship could be mutually beneficial, particularly in trade; Indonesia accounted for 92% of New Zealand’s total exports in agriculture, forestry, and horticulture (Wilson, 2012). In sync with the potential for partnership, both nations have actively sought to bolster their bilateral ties, notably through cultural diplomacy.
Inspired by geographical proximity and similar cultural, linguistic, and genetic identities—as emphasized by Professor Herawati Sudoyo, a senior researcher at the Eijkman Institute (The Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Wellington, 2023)—cultural diplomacy serves as a supplementary tool when policy measures fail to engage people effectively. Its non-coercive nature makes it an attractive approach amidst tensions. Culture also serves as a unique avenue for fostering mutual understanding between countries (Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2022). Thus, governments often leverage cultural diplomacy to introduce their nations and facilitate cooperation.

However, despite the potential for partnership and the role of cultural diplomacy, the relationship between Indonesia and New Zealand was wrenched due to Indonesia’s protectionist stance on imported products, to the detriment of New Zealand (World Trade Organization, 2022). The legal basis for these protectionist policies is outlined in the Indonesian Constitution Number 13 of 2010, Horticulture Article 15, Paragraph (1) (Dispute Settlement - DS477, 2022), which mandates the use of domestic resources, thereby severely limiting imports. Furthermore, New Zealand’s grievances were partly due to Indonesian Constitution Number 41 of 2014, Article 36B, Paragraph (1), restricting meat import without approval from Indonesia’s Ministry of Agriculture, as Indonesia believed it could meet domestic demand.

Import restrictions are explicitly mentioned in Indonesian Constitution Number 19 of 2013, Article 30, which prohibits importing agricultural commodities if domestic supply is sufficient. New Zealand contended that Indonesia’s protectionism violated the 1994 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) Regulation, Article XI, Paragraph (1), discouraging World Trade Organization (WTO) member countries from imposing trade barriers beyond taxes, duties, or other fees (GATT, 1994). In this context, Indonesia enacted trade barriers contravening established international norms, specifically protectionism for imported products. New Zealand took issue with Indonesia’s unilateral trade restrictions as outlined in the Indonesian Constitution Number 7 of 2014 (President of The Republic of Indonesia, 2014). This legislation prohibits importing horticultural and animal products if the import prices fall below a certain threshold in Indonesia. Article 49, Paragraph (4) further stipulates that the Minister can propose additional duties on imported goods to serve the national interest. New Zealand’s concerns were exacerbated by a long-term import ban, found in Indonesian Constitution Number 18 of 2012, Article 36, Paragraph (1) (President of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012). This article mandates that food sources and reserves must prioritize domestic products and permit imports only when Indonesia faces a shortage of national food reserves.

In response to these measures, New Zealand filed a lawsuit against Indonesia with the WTO (Sari and Paksi, 2021). To address New Zealand’s concerns, Indonesia enacted two regulatory changes: Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 23 of 2018 and Minister of Trade Regulation Number 65 of 2018, both aiming to ease the existing tension. Apart from responding to New Zealand’s lawsuit with economic instruments, Indonesia also took a soft power approach amid the dispute. Indonesia opted for a path through cultural diplomacy, manifested in gamelan diplomacy, to resolve its relationship with New Zealand from a different perspective. Concurrently, Indonesia initiated gamelan diplomacy efforts to rebuild trust with New Zealand.

The explanation has yielded an anomaly: the economic dispute elicited not only regulatory adjustments but also invoked the use of gamelan diplomacy. This strategy is rooted in the belief that cultural similarities can foster renewed kinship and trust between nations. Gamelan diplomacy has been viewed as a form of soft power diplomacy, increasingly prevalent in contemporary international relations for winning the goodwill of partner countries. This research revealed that gamelan diplomacy has indeed played a role in improving ties between Indonesia and New Zealand. While it was not the sole factor, its contribution helped restore Indonesia’s image as a viable partner for New Zealand.

Given this context, this study focused on the research question: “What contribution has gamelan diplomacy made in restoring the rift between Indonesia and New Zealand’s
bilateral relations due to imported product protectionism between 2017 and 2021?"

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the contemporary era, cultural diplomacy has sparked both praise and criticism. Numerous scholars have emphasized the importance of cultural diplomacy in high-level political matters. Conversely, some experts argued that cultural diplomacy could be ineffective within the international system due to its inherent limitations. By examining various expert opinions through a literature review, this study aims to establish a supportive stance regarding the utilization of cultural diplomacy in high-stakes political issues, which indirectly and positively influences international relations. The literature review further highlights existing research gaps between proponents and opponents of cultural diplomacy, offering avenues for additional studies. Consequently, the supportive literature bolsters the authors' argument in this research.

According to Matthew Cohen (2019), cultural diplomacy is a modality for Indonesia to engage other nations. Various elements of Indonesian culture, such as traditional dances, Wayang, and gamelan performances, have garnered international attention. Due to its non-destructive nature, state leaders often prefer cultural diplomacy to prioritize peace even though the country is in conflict. Cohen also emphasized the critical role of Indonesian gamelan diplomacy in various countries, including New Zealand, in responding to low and high international issues. Gamelan has established itself as an effective instrument of Indonesian cultural diplomacy and has evolved into an international musical language. Ien Ang, Yudhistir Raj Isar, and Philip Mar (2015) also advocated for cultural diplomacy to enhance national security in a broad, seamless, and sustainable manner. They argued that cultural diplomacy could foster cooperation and mend relationships between countries post-conflict. Philosopher Joseph Nye (2008) emphasized that cultural diplomacy could shape state preferences, guiding governmental actions toward fostering beneficial international partnerships. The inherent appeal of cultural diplomacy facilitates the expression of national interests and a deeper understanding of partner countries.

Nonetheless, some experts have opposed the application of cultural diplomacy. Simon Mark (2010) asserted that cultural diplomacy lacks long-term impact and consensus regarding its definition and effectiveness metrics. Mark noted that this approach often correlates closely with a country's domestic conditions and national interests. Cynthia Schneider (2006) also highlighted the challenges posed by cultural diplomacy, emphasizing that it could catalyze conflict. She argued that culture prioritizes specific groups, making global interests secondary considerations.

Two interlinked dimensions of cultural diplomacy emerged from the academic debates previously mentioned. On the one hand, cultural diplomacy articulates national identities; on the other hand, it presents various challenges stemming from cultural variances within societies. Consequently, cultural diplomacy has been posited as an adjunct approach to addressing international phenomena across multiple domains. This stance is substantiated by the case in which the fraught relations between Indonesia and New Zealand were ameliorated through the positive influence of cultural diplomacy. Due to its non-coercive nature, gamelan diplomacy facilitates nuanced international communication to fulfill state interests rather than employing the forceful demands characterizing traditional approaches. An unexplored research gap was further identified: the role of cultural similarity as a contributing factor to the effectiveness of cultural diplomacy. In Indonesia and New Zealand, shared historical and cultural traits have served as essential underpinnings for the success of gamelan diplomacy in healing the rift between the two nations post-tension. E. Guillon, from the book by Kieldanowiez (2022), contended that public diplomacy exerts a significant influence on the formulation of foreign policy, extending its impact on social dimensions. Public diplomacy is perceived as a potent force that substantially affects the economy, culture, international communication, and politics.
RESEARCH METHOD
This research employed a qualitative method, focusing on the importance of data interpretation to understand social interactions from multiple perspectives. According to Lawrence Neuman (2014), a study utilizes data from prior research and is refined through an understanding of actors’ motives and behavioral variations through this method. Using case studies, specific issues were comprehensively explored based on various data collection over a defined period. Primary data were gathered through questionnaires administered to two New Zealand residents knowledgeable about the topic. These respondents, acquainted with the authors through a previous internship program, were the only ones willing to contribute their views to support this research. Additionally, secondary data were collected by interpreting literature, encompassing journals, books, and news articles.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS
This section explains the findings concerning gamelan diplomacy’s contribution to restoring relations between Indonesia and New Zealand, previously strained due to the dispute over protectionism toward imported products. To explain the correlation of these findings, the discussion was organized into several sections covering economic relations between Indonesia and New Zealand, followed by cultural diplomacy relations between the two countries, and ended with an analysis regarding the emphasis on the contribution of gamelan diplomacy in the relations between the two countries.

ECONOMIC RELATIONS BETWEEN INDONESIA AND NEW ZEALAND
Discussing the economic potential between Indonesia and New Zealand, four significant New Zealand export commodities to Indonesia have contributed to its financial stability (Trading Economics, 2023): (i) food ingredients, mainly processed milk, eggs, and honey (28%); (ii) edible meat and internal organs of animals (14%); (iii) wood and processed products (8.4%); and (iv) fruits and nuts (5.2%). According to Frank Wilson (2012), several factors underline the importance of Indonesia’s role in New Zealand’s trade sector. Indonesia is among the fastest-growing economies and is geographically close to New Zealand. Sustainable economic projections, adaptive human resources, and non-overlapping export-import commodities accompany this growth.

The economic relations between the two countries are also crucial for Indonesia—their trade relations have exhibited complementary dynamics due to non-overlapping commodities. For Indonesia, New Zealand has played a significant role in supplying the Indonesian populace with timber, beef, and dairy products (New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2023). However, these trade conditions have posed a dilemma for Indonesia, aiming to strengthen its economy by optimizing domestic products. The Indonesian government believed importing New Zealand commodities could undermine the sales of similar domestic products. Consequently, despite the partnership potential the two countries share, their relationship was drained due to Indonesia’s restrictions on imported products, adversely affecting New Zealand. As discussed in the introduction, on May 8th, 2014, New Zealand filed a lawsuit against Indonesia at the WTO, alleging that the trade regulations formulated by Indonesia did not adequately consider the partner country’s needs. New Zealand accused Indonesia of violating international trade regulations, outlined explicitly in the GATT of 1994, Article III, Paragraph (4) (GATT, 1994), where infringement is determined when a state takes actions that meet the following three elements.

a. The disputed imported and domestic products are ‘similar products’.

b. The lawsuit parameter involves laws, regulations, or requirements affecting the sale, distribution, or the country’s consumption.

c. Products from the importing country receive a ‘less favorable’ impact.

After being declared guilty by the WTO, New Zealand asked Indonesia to modify its trade restrictions by approving the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) (WTO,
However, Indonesia did not comprehensively amend the previously formulated trade restrictions. Instead, it employed economic instruments through Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 23 of 2018 and Minister of Trade Regulation Number 65 of 2018. In Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 23 of 2018, Indonesia has eased restrictions on the entry of imported products in terms of commodities, permits, and documentation. Likewise, after banning imports, Indonesia relaxed trade rules through Minister of Trade Regulation Number 65 of 2018, which pertains to export-import provisions for animal products. Although an economic solution has been detected for the conflict, the tension between the two countries remained due to the international trade barriers imposed by Indonesia, triggering trust issues for New Zealand. Amid this economic dispute, Indonesian Ambassador Tantowi Yahya intensified cultural diplomacy efforts, believing that trust has become a crucial element that needs to be restored.

CULTURAL RELATIONS AND GAMELAN DIPLOMACY BETWEEN INDONESIA AND NEW ZEALAND

Cultural cooperation between the two nations began because some New Zealanders were unfamiliar with Indonesia. This lack of awareness led to the formation of the New Zealand Indonesia Association (NZIA) in Auckland (New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage Te Manatu Taonga, 2016). As an association comprising individuals from both countries, NZIA aims to strengthen relations between Indonesia and New Zealand by initiating cultural diplomacy programs. NZIA involves non-state actors, such as educational institutions and art community groups, and utilizes cultural instruments for dialogue through batik, shadow puppets, dance performances, or traditional Indonesian music.

International relations researcher Zhu Majie (2022) argued that when policymakers overlook societal cultural elements, their decisions could trigger misunderstandings and even societal rejection. Cultural cooperation between Indonesia and New Zealand was also agenda-driven. Generally, Indonesia aims to achieve three objectives through artistic collaboration with New Zealand. The first is to use cultural diplomacy to balance the interactions between the two countries. According to the Director General of the Ministry of Education and Culture, Dr. Hilmar Farid (The Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Wellington, 2023), relations orchestrated through cultural diplomacy could ease tense situations due to their people-to-people nature. Secondly, cultural diplomacy, not limited to the use of gamelan, could serve as a branding tool for Indonesia. Furthermore, cultural diplomacy could enhance Indonesia’s credibility in the international system and promote a positive image.

Furthermore, two specific agendas were set for 2017-2021, during which Indonesian Ambassador Tantowi Yahya intensified gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand. Initially, the agenda focused on strengthening soft power diplomacy. According to the strategic plan of the Indonesian Embassy in Wellington, enhancing quiet power diplomacy is a crucial objective underpinning the cultural cooperation between Indonesia and New Zealand. It aims to expand opportunities for collaboration between the two nations in other strategic domains (New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2023). With robust soft power diplomacy, the Indonesian government believed it could optimally establish its relationships with New Zealand across various sectors. Moreover, the agenda sought to realize President Joko Widodo’s mandate to demonstrate Indonesia as part of the Pacific community. Ambassador Tantowi Yahya (Sururi, 2023) stated that cultural diplomacy has become a highly potent approach. He argued that although this method could often appear subtle, its power has been compelling enough to win the hearts of partner nations. Through this second agenda, the fraternal ties between Indonesia and New Zealand were expected to become increasingly apparent. By providing evidence of equality through cultural diplomacy, Indonesia’s positive image could be enhanced, alongside efforts to bolster its relations.

New Zealand’s receptiveness to Indonesian gamelan was evidenced by the gamelan orchestra collaboration established by the Music Department at the Victoria University of Wellington in the early 1970s (New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage Te Manatu
Taonga, 2016). Zamroni (2021) supported openness in the cultural sphere between the two countries because both have adopted a multicultural education system, enabling people to be more open, tolerant, and cooperative in embracing diversity as a catalyst for peaceful collaboration. This openness has further been substantiated by articles on the Indonesian Embassy in Wellington’s website, stating that since 1974, gamelan has been well-recognized by New Zealanders and has even been incorporated into the curricula of various New Zealand universities (The Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Wellington, 2023). In addition to geographical proximity and cultural similarities, long-standing friendship emerged as another driving factor. Specifically, music functions as a significant entry point to engage and win over diplomatic targets.

Indonesian Parliament member Bambang Soesatyo (General Secretariat of the People’s Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023) stated during the event “The Symphony of Friendship” that music could unite people from both countries. Soesatyo asserted that cultural diplomacy was pivotal in breaking down barriers and differences between Indonesia and New Zealand. Incorporating music, specifically gamelan performances, has been envisioned as a bridge fostering peaceful and fraternal relations between the two nations. Between 2017 and 2021, gamelan performances in New Zealand saw a noticeable increase. For example, the Taniwha Jaya gamelan community regularly performed these shows. The scope of gamelan diplomacy has also widened to include performances in public spaces such as Wellington’s central train station and at the New Zealand Festival 2020. The intensification of gamelan diplomacy aims to bolster the effectiveness of cultural diplomacy in strengthening bilateral relations.

Since its introduction to New Zealand in 1974 (The Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in Wellington, 2023), gamelan has been well-received by the local populace. It has even been incorporated into the curricula of various universities. However, the trajectory of gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand has had its ebbs and flows, primarily due to inconsistent implementation in its early days. Initially, gamelan diplomacy targeted specific groups, rendering its impact suboptimal. The situation improved dramatically from 2017 to 2021, coinciding with Tantowi Yahya’s tenure as the Indonesian Ambassador in Wellington. During this period, the frequency and reach of gamelan diplomacy activities expanded considerably, engaging a broader cross-section of society.

For instance, Indonesian Ambassador Tantowi Yahya commended two New Zealand citizens, Dr. Megan Collins and Jack Hooker, who succeeded in showcasing gamelan in a captivating manner. They received the Arts and Culture Scholarship (Yulianingsih, 2017). Addressing gamelan diplomacy was once—limited scope—considered ineffective for solely involving specific countries and communities—the implementation during the 2017-2021 period witnessed significant expansion. Previously criticized for its inability to engage the New Zealand populace, gamelan diplomacy has innovatively collaborated with other facets of Indonesian cultural diversity in New Zealand, reaching a broader audience (The Embassy of The Republic of Indonesia in Wellington, 2023). Judith Exley, a New Zealand composer involved with gamelan for over 40 years, has contributed substantially to disseminating gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand, particularly among communities beyond the Victoria University of Wellington and the New Zealand School of Music. As it continued to broaden its reach, Indonesian gamelan diplomacy has extended to various cities in New Zealand, including Auckland, Wellington, Dunedin, Palmerston North, New Plymouth, Whanganui, and Christchurch.

CONTRIBUTION OF GAMELAN DIPLOMACY IN INDONESIA AND NEW ZEALAND BILATERAL RELATIONS

After examining the economic and cultural variables, the contribution of gamelan diplomacy in bolstering the government’s efforts to mend relations between the two nations was analyzed from multiple perspectives. Cultural diplomacy has been understood as exchanging ideas, art forms, and cultural aspects through a delegation staged in foreign countries to foster mutual understanding. According to Patricia M. Goff (2013),
three indicators could gauge cultural diplomacy’s efficacy; connection is the first. Implementing cultural diplomacy was a conduit to connect local communities with diaspora populations in partner countries. This connection cultivated a mutual interest, informing foreign policy formulation in a manner catering to the needs of the citizens of both nations. Amidst fluctuating relations between Indonesia and New Zealand, gamelan diplomacy emerged as a bridge facilitating communication. Political and artistic observers contended that gamelan has successfully established itself as an iconic Indonesian music genre in New Zealand, gaining affection from local audiences. Both governments have endorsed it as a medium capable of strengthening bilateral ties.

This connection in cultural diplomacy also pertained to fostering positive interstate relations. Countries possessed abundant information about each other but often lacked a comprehensive understanding of these nations. Data related to other countries, mainly when focused solely on government-to-government interactions, often failed to engage with the most critical level of societal analysis. Ironically, a nation’s success was invariably linked to the extent to which its citizenry felt actively involved and connected. In the context of gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand, it became evident that the approach adopted was not state-centric. Instead, gamelan diplomacy served as a mechanism to elevate mutual trust, paving the way for collaborative endeavors in various other sectors, including the economy. As David Landes (2000) pointed out, economic and cultural performance are mutually influential. The shifting dynamics of international relations post-Cold War have also underscored the significance of ‘people power’ in addressing global challenges across multiple sectors.

As reported by CNN Indonesia (Juniman, 2017), Indonesia’s intensified gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand not only captivated students from the Victoria University of Wellington and the New Zealand School of Music but also garnered students’ interest at the Otago University in Dunedin. As the second-largest city in southern New Zealand, Dunedin boasted at least 800 students skilled in playing the gamelan as of 2017. The connectivity between Indonesia and New Zealand through gamelan diplomacy was also highlighted by Indonesian Ambassador Tantowi Yahya during the award ceremony for two New Zealand “Fathers of Gamelan” (Yulianingsih, 2017). In his speech, Ambassador Tantowi Yahya expressed his gratitude to the late Dr. Allan Thomas and Prof. Jack Body, two ethnomusicologists who have significantly contributed to the introduction and development of gamelan in New Zealand.

Establishing a connection between countries was further bolstered by the consistency in its implementation. The steadfastness of cultural diplomacy actors in disseminating culture was pivotal in fostering mutual interest, especially amid the tension. Cultural diplomacy proved effective when its actors consistently extended their influence. This consistent effort was vital in triggering mutual interest between nations so that, even in tense situations, both parties could consider peaceful approaches. Indonesia successfully achieved consistency in gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand through various initiatives, such as incorporating gamelan into the curriculum at the New Zealand School of Music and Victoria University of Wellington via the PERF250 program. The Indonesian government could draw upon historical roots to engage the New Zealand public in gamelan diplomacy, showcasing similarities between the musical instruments of both countries. Regarding musical culture, commonalities between Indonesia and New Zealand emerged as evident in some of their traditional musical instruments (Johnson, 2008). The Maori tribe, native to New Zealand, has employed a wide array of metal wind and percussion instruments similar to those found in Indonesia. Gareth Farr, one of the New Zealand composers who noted the similarity between Indonesian and New Zealand musical instruments, emphasized that the commonalities profoundly influenced his creative work in the musical styles of both countries, focusing on rhythmic percussion ensembles like the gong ensemble.

Traditionally, the percussion instrument called a “gong” in Indonesia is known as “pahu” in New Zealand. Percussion ensembles have been increasingly widespread, especially among Melanesians in Indonesia and New Zealand (New Zealand Electronic Text Collection,
Retrieved 2023). With this historical background, the Indonesian government utilized the gamelan as a traditional musical instrument that was distinctive, unique, and new to New Zealanders, yet resembling New Zealand culture. The Indonesian government strategically optimized these factors to capture the interest of the New Zealand public in gamelan diplomacy, which also significantly influenced the musical works of New Zealand composers. Furthermore, Indonesia provided gamelan sets for New Zealand. Since the introduction of gamelan diplomacy and Indonesia’s consistent efforts in staging, training, workshops, and offering support facilities for the New Zealand community, both countries have viewed gamelan as a vital instrument in soft power diplomacy, particularly in enhancing Indonesia’s positive image.

Cultural diplomacy could be gauged by the innovation in its implementation while maintaining its uniqueness. Innovation in cultural diplomacy was essential to facilitate the transfer of information from cultural diplomacy actors (communicators) to the recipients (communicants). However, Goff (2013) emphasized that this innovation must preserve the distinctive elements of the cultural instrument. The acceptance of gamelan diplomacy was bolstered by its two-way approach, creating momentum for New Zealand to view Indonesia as a partner in addressing international phenomena. This aspect of innovation in cultural diplomacy was evident in Indonesia’s openness to learning and performing gamelan at various festivals. As a result, this innovation successfully garnered interest from New Zealand composers, facilitating the formation of a shared understanding through the effective implementation of gamelan diplomacy.

The innovation initiated by the Indonesian government in executing gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand was evident in the acculturation. By adjusting and collaborating with New Zealand composers, the innovation in gamelan music was more readily accepted by the local New Zealand community. Additionally, the current approach to gamelan diplomacy, actively involving the people of New Zealand, has generated a positive perception of Indonesia. The involvement of New Zealanders in the gamelan diplomacy process contributed to the impression that Indonesia was a friendly partner aiming to foster positive relations with New Zealand.

This study also examined the gamelan diplomacy contribution by the multistakeholder diplomacy (MSD) concept. This research employed the MSD framework by Brian Hocking (2006), encompassing international relations involving non-state actors. MSD is characterized by nine indicators that distinguish it from older diplomacy models. In terms of context, MSD is not limited to the political realm; its form also diverges in that the diplomatic process is not solely centered on state leadership. MSD emphasizes the significance of collaborative participation between state and non-state actors, each fulfilling its distinct role. The communication patterns in MSD are inclusive, open, and wide-ranging. This approach also serves special functions, such as promoting global interests, facilitating oversight processes, and acting as a supplementary tool to address deficiencies in traditional diplomatic procedures. MSD employs a domestic-international approach concerning its implementation location, emphasizing specific missions and actors in its representational pattern. Lastly, owing to its flexible and dynamic nature, MSD is not bound by rigid regulations.

In practice, gamelan diplomacy was an approach operating within a cultural context and diverging from a state-centric focus, involving the collaboration of state and non-state actors, each playing their respective roles. From a communication standpoint, the implementation of gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand was inclusive and open, and it enjoyed a broad network. Furthermore, gamelan diplomacy specialized in improving bilateral relations between Indonesia and New Zealand, which were strained in previous years. Given that its execution involved the Indonesian community’s active involvement in other countries, this approach was categorized as domestic-international diplomacy regarding location. A representational pattern characterized the implementation of gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand, focused on achieving specific missions, thereby
warranting the involvement of multiple stakeholders. Moreover, gamelan diplomacy was not constrained by stringent regulations, rendering it more dynamic and flexible. The alignment of gamelan diplomacy with the MSD framework is summarized in the following table.

Table 1. MSD Indicator Implementation in Gamelan Diplomacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>MSD Indicator</th>
<th>The Implementation in Gamelan Diplomacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Leadership was not limited to the government. A crucial role was attached to the Indonesian Ambassador Tantowi Yahya and Padhang Moncar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Engaging government and non-state actors, such as Indonesian Ambassador Tantowi Yahya and communities (Padhang Moncar, Kamasi, Taniwha Jaya), was critical. Media outlets related to government programs (The Wellington New Zealand Gamelan article site, Victoria University of Wellington, news pages of the Indonesian Embassy in Wellington, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) as well as media not affiliated with the government (The Jakarta Post and the Voice of the World Diaspora: Media Overseas Indonesia) also played significant roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.     | Role           | • Indonesian Ambassador Tantowi Yahya implemented gamelan diplomacy in collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.  
• The community (Kamasi, Padhang Moncar, Taniwha Jaya) introduced and disseminated gamelan diplomacy among New Zealanders.  
• Media served as an information bridge between government and society, shaped public opinion, and justified Indonesia’s positive image. |
| 5.     | Communication pattern | Open, inclusive, broad |
| 6.     | Function       | Restoring the tenuous bilateral relations between Indonesia and New Zealand |
| 7.     | Location       | Domestic – International |
| 8.     | Pattern of representation | Having a specific mission involving multiple actors |
| 9.     | Regulation     | Non-binding, flexible, and dynamic |

Source: Processed by Authors, 2023
The effectiveness of gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand was also demonstrated through the contribution of the emerging positive impact. Gamelan diplomacy contributed to drafting a strategic plan for bilateral relations between the two countries, which would be further strengthened. The effectiveness of gamelan diplomacy was also proven by its influence on the increasing export-import activities between the two countries in 2017-2021. Moreover, according to the Indonesian Embassy in Wellington’s strategic plan for the 2020-2024 approach (Decree of the Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia in Wellington, 2021), Indonesia and New Zealand agreed to strengthen their bilateral relations in the socio-cultural field, which would be realized by involving more non-state actors such as the community and educational institutions within the framework of a people-to-people. Their agreement was also formulated in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs strategy, which refers to enhancing Indonesia’s positive image globally through several strategies, such as (i) initiating public diplomacy activities by increasing the contribution of the non-state actors’ role; (ii) increasing production in culture and society, tourism, government, investment and immigration, and exports; (iii) optimizing the use of Indonesia’s soft power diplomacy both regionally and internationally.

Indonesia and New Zealand’s commitment to further strengthen their bilateral relations was marked by essential agreements at the 9th Joint Ministerial Commission (JMC) in July 2020. Both countries agreed to remove non-tariff trade barriers to achieve the trade target 2024 of IDR 40 trillion (New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2023). Although not the only factor in the success of reestablishing positive relations between Indonesia and New Zealand, gamelan diplomacy has succeeded in becoming a complementary instrument in supporting the realization of state interests by focusing on image creation and the partner country’s trust in Indonesia. Another influence was depicted in the condition where export-import activities between the two countries experienced a decline, marked by a recession in the total number of Indonesian exports to New Zealand in 2014-2016, specifically, USD 486.6 (2014) to USD 436.25 (2015) and USD 366.54 (2016). Entering 2017, the peak of gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand to boost Indonesia’s image as a good partner, Indonesia’s total exports to New Zealand escalated by USD 437.42 (2017), USD 490.66 (2018), and USD 445.2 (2019) (Forecast, 2023).

Thus, as the most significant bilateral partner in the Pacific region, economic relations between Indonesia and New Zealand experienced an upward trend of 6.62% in 2017-2021, which coincided with the periodization of the gamelan diplomacy implementation (New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2023). The efforts to improve Indonesia and New Zealand relations were evident. Despite experiencing economic tension, the collaboration of soft power instruments and strengthening agreements between the two countries restored New Zealand’s trust in Indonesia. The re-establishment of their excellent relations was depicted in their commitment in 2018, represented by Indonesian President Joko Widodo and New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern, to strengthen their economic relations more transparently (Republic of Indonesia Cabinet Secretariat, 2023). Those facts illustrated that gamelan diplomacy was proven successful in supporting the creation of Indonesia’s positive image, friendly relations with New Zealand, and restoration of economic cooperation. These findings align with the theoretical framework’s central argument that cultural diplomacy as a P2P approach will essentially be a complementary instrument for realizing G2G efforts.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the research question, “What contribution has gamelan diplomacy made in restoring the rift between Indonesia and New Zealand bilateral relations due to imported products protectionism in 2017-2021?” it was evident that soft power played a crucial role in influencing four critical aspects of effective international relations. These aspects included (i) efforts to harmonize frequencies between countries, (ii) the creation of a positive national image, (iii) establishing a country’s global credibility, and (iv) fostering strengthened cooperation in various strategic fields.
Gamelan diplomacy in New Zealand was proven effective, contributing to governmental efforts measured by the Goff cultural diplomacy effectiveness parameters and fulfilling the MSD indicators. It also contributed to raising trade between Indonesia and New Zealand. While not the only strategy available, this research unveiled that gamelan diplomacy became a supportive factor in enhancing Indonesia’s positive image in the eyes of New Zealand—this improved image bolstered cooperation in other strategic areas, such as the economy. Consistent with the analysis section, gamelan diplomacy, as a form of cultural diplomacy, successfully strengthened relations between the two countries, particularly at the individual and societal levels. Given their similar historical backgrounds and Indonesia’s goodwill, gamelan diplomacy presented Indonesia as a friendly and reliable partner for New Zealand.

Gamelan diplomacy effectively built connectivity between the two nations through a series of initiatives introducing this approach in New Zealand, along with recognizing the enthusiasm the New Zealand public depicted. The approach’s contribution was further supported by its consistent implementation, articulated through regular performances across diverse audiences to establish diplomatic ties based on mutual understanding. This consistency was exemplified by incorporating gamelan courses into New Zealand’s educational curriculum, supported by workshops, training sessions, and the permanent loan of gamelan instruments from Indonesia. Additionally, the innovative process of gamelan diplomacy inspired New Zealand composers to create and foster a two-way cultural dialogue between the nations.

Furthermore, gamelan diplomacy supplemented conventional strategies, partially healing the relations between the two countries, especially after the past economic tension. It aligns well with MSD principles by focusing on cultural context, decentralizing state leadership’s role, and involving domestic and international non-state actors to achieve specific objectives without rigid regulations. Consequently, gamelan diplomacy illustrates that the use of MSD in the contemporary era holds a priority level equal to conventional diplomatic tools in achieving a comprehensive state foreign policy.
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