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Introduction

• This year, consistent with the adventurous spirit of FPCI, our organization has continued to grow. We have continued to connect to expand our reach, to add more chapters to our organization, and to spread our message about Indonesian internationalism.

• In 2020 FPCI became the founding member of the Paris Peace Forum – we are very proud of that – and our 1000 Abrahamic Circles Project won the Intercultural Innovation Award from Austria. We held countless virtual lectures, we convened the Jakarta Forum, the China Forum, the Korea Roundtable Conference, the Vaccine Forum, we held Government - Business Forum, we changed the Conference on Indonesian Foreign Policy to a Global Town Hall on the COVID-19 world which was participated by 7 Foreign Ministers from Indonesia, China, Russia, India, the EU, Australia, and South Africa, plus the Director-General of the WHO Dr. Tedros and many world-class speakers.

• We also gave policy recommendations to the Indonesian Government – whether they like it or not, we still give it to them. We gave advice to embassies. We connected campuses. We have connected think-tanks within Indonesia and outside Indonesia. We wrote articles and Op-Eds and published recent surveys. And best of all, yesterday, I did a live TV interview with Robert De Niro. To top it all off, I personally survived and beat COVID-19 in the month of September. It has been quite an exciting year for me personally and of course for FPCI as an organization.

• The year 2020 was the year no one could have imagined or predicted in 2019. I believe 2021 is going to be a better year. In December last year, we did not know anything about COVID-19. But the good thing about 2021 is that we know with certainty that vaccines now exist, they are being produced, and will start to roll out at some point next year.

• Today, I wanted to talk to you about some of the big things that we believe Indonesia should get ready for in 2021. Let me go through the list of what are these 7 big things.
1. The Big Picture: We Are Entering A World Order in Flux

- To be honest, I am a bit disappointed that COVID-19 did not reform the world order. The theory was that a crisis is the best catalyst to change. Prof. Klaus Schwab of the World Economic Forum called for “the Great Reset”. This was echoed by IMF Chief Katalina Georgieva, who said the “great reverse” can be turned to “great reset”. UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres also in December called for something similar but dialled down a little bit; rather than calling it a “great reset”, he just called it a “reset”. Leaders around the world were calling for “building back better”, and this actually became a slogan of the Biden administration.

- Even though the UN Secretary-General said the COVID-19 is “the greatest challenge since World War 2”, so far we have not seen the world order changed by the COVID-19 crisis. There was no reform of the UN Security Council. WHO did not change. G20 did not change. WTO did not change. There were no new institutions created. There were two good 2 UN Resolutions on COVID-19, but they did not call for reforming the world order.

- In fact, more countries were more interested in recovery rather than pursuing a “great reset”. Because these institutions did not change in 2020 when the time was most difficult, there is little chance they will change in 2021 when the vaccines will be coming.

- We also witnessed in 2020 the absence or lack of global leadership. The US, preoccupied with elections, had no interest to lead. Europe gave a lot to others but did not lead. China also gave a lot to others but did not lead globally. Around the world, never before have so many countries throughout so many regions turned inward for many months. And never before have so many countries feeling a sense of national insecurity at the same time. And never before have so many people lived in a climate of fear. Fear of going out. Fear of doing business. Fear of travel or going to the movies, et cetera.

- Foreign policy slowed down and was seen as secondary interest, a luxury. In fact, on the vaccines issue, it was think tanks, NGOs, and civil society who led the way.

- Meanwhile, regional responses to COVID-19 have been a mixed record. When Italy was hit by COVID-19, the EU response was slow and has picked up ever since. The EU has produced a budget that includes a strong COVID-19 response. ASEAN also moved swiftly and has held a number of meetings, including with extra-regional actors. But I do believe that intra-ASEAN relations could be stronger and if we look at the numbers, ASEAN’s extra-regional cooperation — with China, the EU, Australia — was stronger than intra-ASEAN cooperation.

- We also did not see any significant change in patterns of behaviour. I remember in Indonesia, during the tsunami crisis of 2004, it took 5 months for the stakeholders to change their conflictual behaviour and produce a peace deal.
which ended the armed conflict in Aceh and changed conflict, politics, and society forever in Aceh. Nothing of that sort happened during the COVID-19 crisis, even though 70 million people were infected and some 1.5 million have died.

• The most disappointing thing is that the US and China failed to work together to address the global COVID-19 problem, despite good opportunities to do so. It would have been a powerful signal to the international community if Washington DC and Beijing were to set aside their differences and cooperated. But neither showed any interest in collaborating and they ended up working separately. Back in 1958, the US and Soviet Union, in the bleak atmosphere of Cold War, had the maturity to work together to eradicate smallpox. The two superpowers facilitated not only mass production of vaccines but also program to vaccinate the third world. As a consequence by 1980s smallpox had been officially eradicated. That was the good news in 1958. What happened to statesmanship in 2020?

• But it is not only US-China, failure to cooperate also happened in conflict zones. To help contain COVID-19, the UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres in March this year called for a “global ceasefire” in conflict areas. It did not work out well, despite some initial efforts to oblige that call. The fighting continued in Cameroon, Yemen, Colombia, Ukraine, the Philippines, Libya, and in many other places. When the UN Security Council echoed the call for a global ceasefire for 90 days in June, 3 months after the first call, the same results happened — fighting in conflict areas continued, even to this day.

• Nonetheless, the world order in 2021 will be somewhat different than that of 2020. First, the liberal international order will emerge weaker than before COVID-19 arrived. This is mainly because the United States as the creator and champion of the liberal international order turned its back on the global COVID-19 situation, and undermined the multilateral institutions, by withdrawing from WHO, the UN Human Rights Council and even threatened to withdraw from the WTO. The US as the world’s second-largest democracy also became a dysfunctional democracy in 2020, and this hurt the structure and foundation of the liberal international order.

• Secondly, as Professor Jeffry Sachs has pointed out, Asia is emerging better-off from the COVID-19 crisis compared to the United States and will enter 2021 with fewer cases, less fatality, higher economic growth, more cooperation. It is predicted that Asia will rebound faster than much of the world. It also matters that in the midst of the pandemic, Asia struck the largest trade deal in the world, and the only major trade deal signed in 2020, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP).

• I have been surprised that the RCEP has been under-reported and under-appreciated by the world media. But the fact that RCEP is concluded on schedule was an enormous accomplishment given that many other diplomatic agenda have
been delayed and growing mood against globalization. This demonstrates the uniqueness of Asia in the world order.

- Thirdly, the world order with President Biden in it is bound to be different than a world order with President Trump in it. We can expect renewed American diplomatic activism and a display of some statesmanship from Biden. But there is a great likelihood that US global leadership will be slow to take place. In the first six months or more, President Biden will need to fill tens of thousands of jobs in Washington DC — and that will take a lot of efforts, energy, and time. Most importantly he will need to struggle with an out-of-control pandemic with 17 million cases and 300,000 deaths, and counting, and also the economic recession. President Biden will not want to be seen jetting around the world while the American people at home are suffering huge losses.

- Fourth, in 2021, it is certain that multilateralism will get a boost — a little or a lot remains to be seen, but we are bound to see greater political will, diplomatic push, and more action in support of multilateralism.

2. Geopolitics: Facing the Head Wind of Fragile Competitive Multipolarity

- In 2020, the much hoped for geopolitical reset is not happening. Indeed, there has been no significant change in the bilateral relationships of the major powers during the COVID-19 crisis. In the diplomatic world, we saw the establishment of diplomatic relations between Israel and UAE, Bahrain, Morocco, Sudan, brokered by the United States, but these happened regardless of COVID-19.

- What we will see in 2021 is the entrenchment of competitive multipolarity marked by strategic insecurity and low trust. Multipolarity, as opposed to unipolarity, means there are several major powers. Who are these poles? The United States, China, Russia. I would also consider Europe a pole, even though on strategic issues, Europe tends to gravitate towards the US. I do not consider India, Japan, Indonesia, or the UK a pole.

- What is strategically significant is that the western world will become a more coherent grouping compared to the last 4 years. In the last 4 years, the western world has been divided, disoriented and distracted, but the Biden Presidency is expected to return US leadership and some degree of coherence and coordination to the western world.

- Thus, US - UK relations will improve. US - Europe relations will improve. US - Canada relations will improve. This is of strategic importance because historically speaking, the western world, unlike any other grouping in the world, is the grouping of countries most capable of delivering common action. It was the western world that created the liberal international order; that created multilateral institutions; that created military alliances; that imposed sanctions on others; that pushed for
democracy and human rights; that pushed for free trade; that created the coalition of like-minded states or coalition of the willing.

- The largest segment of this competitive multipolar world is the US-China competition. Here, the US and China are locked in a competitive distrustful acrimonious zero-sum relationship. To the US, China—not Russia—is the only country in the world that can credibly challenge its strategic primacy and economic position globally, and has the intention to do so. There is a considerable sense of insecurity in how the US sees China, like a beauty queen that does not want to lose her crown to the new girl. China, on the other hand, is rapidly growing its power across the board, strategically, diplomatically, economically, politically, technologically and sees itself as a great power capable of competing with the US in every sector.

- This, therefore, is a contest where US exceptionalism meets China’s entitlement. This is where US growing insecurity meets China’s growing confidence. This is a play that will involve ambition and pride, on both sides. No one knows how this will play out, and for how long, and when this pattern will change.

- In my view, this is not a contest for global leadership. This is a contest for political and diplomatic influence. China for now is not interested in taking the mantle of global leadership, which would entail too much responsibility, resources and risks—for which China is not yet ready. In some ways, China perhaps likes seeing the US over-extended, drained and bogged down in the exercise of its global leadership. The real contest between the US and China therefore is the competition for political and diplomatic influence in other countries.

- This contest will be most intense in continental and maritime areas peripheral or proximate to China. This means places like Southeast Asia, South Asia, Central Asia, and the Pacific islands. These also happen to be areas where China is actively promoting the Belt and Road Initiatives. The US will see the Belt and Road not from its merit as a connectivity project but from the perspective of this contest for political influence.

- This contest involves not just government officials, military and intelligence, it also involves, to varying degrees, the media, the think tanks, the technological community, and the business community. It is worth noting that in this contest, China’s public diplomacy has done much better than the US.

- Under the Biden Presidency, this contest will see greater emphasis on the issue of “values”. In this, there is likelihood that US foreign policy will again be more judgemental and intrusive to other countries.

- This condition will provide space for middle powers to play a greater role. The middle powers are not coherent at the moment. There are no groupings of middle powers in the world, but they do have the versatility and resources and
connections to play a greater role. The question is whether or not there is a political and diplomatic will to do so.

3. In Pandemic Year 2, Expect A Greater Tussle Between Vaccine Nationalism Versus Vaccine Globalism

- The third big thing is Vaccine Nationalism versus Vaccine Globalism. Let us make no mistake about this, despite the vaccine euphoria, 2021 will still be a pandemic year. COVID-19 crisis will still be with us throughout 2021. COVID-19 will still be center stage in national and international affairs. Most people globally will still be at risk and for some countries the second, third, or even fourth wave may be coming in 2021 and beyond.
- Globally now, we have about 73 million cases and this number will continue to rise and so will the death toll. The herd immunity which requires 50% – 80% of the population to be vaccinated globally will not be achieved in 2021, perhaps not even by 2022 or 2023.
- For the United States, for example, herd immunity will only be achieved by the most ambitious estimate, perhaps by Q3 or Q4 next year, if not even later.
- But the one certainty is that the vaccines are available and the problem here is that most of the vaccines have been pre-ordered by rich countries. According to a recent article in Foreign Affairs magazine, rich countries have reserved an order of 9 thousand billion doses in 2021. This forms most or the bulk of the vaccines and this is going to take up almost a whole production of vaccines worldwide in the year 2021. Countries like the United States, Canada, Japan, Australia, and several European countries have pre-ordered the vaccines enough to vaccinate their own people several times over.
- Vaccines are certain to be a diplomatic, political, economic, and logistical challenge. Just like how COVID-19 had been the most “political” virus ever, the vaccines will also be political. And for many governments, securing the vaccines for their people is not just a public health issue, it is also a question of political competence and accountability, and in some cases, even legitimacy.
- Vaccine nationalism will be a strong impulse in 2021 because this is a political thing. For countries with a mid-sized or large population, including Indonesia, there will be a serious challenge on how to logistically distribute the vaccines effectively. Distributing the vaccines will not be like distributing rice or “sembako” or candy, it will require a very elaborate and complex technical requirement including very specific refrigeration system which needed to be handled very professionally. It seems that there are many governments that have not thought this over carefully or are not prepared for this complex distribution system. Any deficiencies in the distribution system will become a political issue.
• But the real test of solidarity is in the realm of vaccine cooperation. If the world cannot agree on resolving conflicts on trade, on geopolitical rivalry, on 5G, then at least they can work together on the notion of “vaccines for all”.

• The good news is that “vaccine globalism”, if we can invent the term, is becoming a much stronger, politically correct norm. Vaccine globalism is the spirit of cooperation that sees COVID-19 vaccines as a global public good and thus seeks to ensure that all countries in the world would have fair and equal access to COVID-19 vaccines. It is a good sign that the UN Secretary-General, WHO, the President of the World Bank, and the Head of the IMF have all called for global vaccine cooperation.

• The best embodiment of vaccine globalism is COVAX which is a collaborative effort by GAVI, CEPI (Coalition of Epidemic Preparedness Initiative) and WHO. COVAX is the largest multilateral effort since the Paris Climate Agreement and it is the best hope for us to defeat this pandemic globally with a global solution that will help low- and middle-income countries, so that they too can get the vaccines.

• There are about 180 governments involved in COVAX, representing around 90% of the global population. COVAX aims to make 2 billion doses COVID-19 vaccines available by the end of 2021. About 95 low- and middle-income countries have been identified as eligible to receive these vaccines which probably would be sold at the low cost of 3 dollars, much cheaper than PCR test. Unfortunately for different reasons the United States and Russia are still not part of COVAX. FPCI calls on Russia and the United States, the two great vaccines powers to join COVAX in 2021. COVAX’s biggest challenge is funding and they have raised several billion dollars, I think between 3 and 4 billion dollars, but they still need an additional 24 billion dollars for 2021. This is indeed a big amount, but to be fair, it is only a very miniscule portion of the global stimulus agreed at the recent G20 Summit. It is about half percent of all the global stimulus agreed at the recent G20.

• Dr. Tedros of WHO has said that without funding, COVAX and the idea of vaccine for all is just in danger of becoming “no more than a noble gesture”. The UN Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres, has lamented that “vaccine nationalism is moving at full speed” and this is a matter of concern for the notion of ensuring “vaccine for all”.

• Vaccine globalism is by far the best and most positive and inspiring development of world affairs in 2020 and hopefully in 2021. Why? Because it is a very concrete and ambitious project for global solidarity. It demonstrates that governments, companies, and civil societies can work together selflessly for global solutions. And it demonstrates that the international community can work out a model of cooperation. It is free from ideology or competing political interest, with a focused attention on ensuring vaccines for all. And it is significant because it is a global solution that is led by civil society and NGOs.
• But things are still fragile. There was a recent internal document of GAVI which was reported by Reuters today that said that “the risk of failure of COVAX project is really high”. Dr. Tedros has said that yes, everybody wants a vaccine that is a global public product but “this is a political choice, a political commitment, and we want political leaders to decide on this. In other words, this is really a matter of political will by leaders”.

• But I do believe in at least two good things that will come out good. One is that there is a different mindset today compared to a year ago. When the Wuhan outbreak happened in January this year, to be honest, not many people around the world cared. They were just thinking “Hey, let's keep that away from us” and the Wuhan people were all alone in this. So there was a feeling of physical and mental isolation when the people in Wuhan suffered from COVID-19. But today the mood is very different: the mindset is that “Hey, nobody is alone, we are all in this together. If somebody still has COVID-19 then the rest of the world is at risk”. So what we have today is very much in contrast with the notion that “you are all alone” that was experienced by Wuhan.

• Secondly, I think it will be shown that vaccine nationalism and vaccine globalism can go together. Yes, there are countries like Australia, Canada, Japan, and the United States that have ordered vaccines several times over for their population but I think they will come to their senses and they will say “Hey, we do not need this many doses and we will contribute to other countries that are in need”. I think Canada and Japan are thinking this way, for example. I read an article by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau who said that stressed that “vaccine for all” is the way to go, and the international community must ensure equitable and fair access to all. So, there should be no conflict between vaccine nationalism and vaccine globalism.

• For Indonesia, this means that we have to play an active role in COVAX. I think we should spend a lot of energy and push to ensure that COVAX will be a successful project. Indonesia joined COVAX a bit late, the announcement was made in October and the last time I checked even our contribution was very small, only 1 million dollars so far. We have always said that our heart is always with the developing countries. This is an extraordinary time, so one way of demonstrating that is by supporting in full force the work of COVAX to help low and middle income countries.

4. Climate Change Will Return to the Top of Global Agenda

• In 2021, climate change will be a big story again, a big project again.
• 2020 marks the fifth year of the Paris climate treaty. Despite the withdrawal of the United States, there has been some good progress. 50 countries made commitments for net-zero emissions, and in the last few months, China committed
carbon neutrality by 2060 or sooner, South Africa (also another big economy), South Korea, and Japan’s Prime Minister Suga also announced a commitment for carbon neutrality. Over 1,000 major companies around the world have signed a pledge to commit to science based targets. So climate change will be back at the top of the agenda in 2021. President-elect Joe Biden has made it clear that he will re-join the Paris treaty on his first day in the office and has appointed John Kerry as his special envoy on climate change. This is good news.

### ARE WE ON TRACK TO LIMIT TEMPERATURE RISE?

The World Is Not on Track to Limit Temperature Rise to 1.5°C

- The Paris treaty target of 1.5 degree Celsius temperature rise is an ambitious but practical objective and 2021 will be very important because the window to keep the global temperature rise below 1.5 degree Celsius is getting smaller and smaller.
- There are several problems with this target because whatever progress we are making is not enough. As seen in the chart, the red line projection is where we will end up presently, with 52-58 gigatons of carbon dioxide by 2030, and it is very different than the 2030 scenario in which the target should be 25-30 gigatons of carbon dioxide. The difference is very large. We need to find a way to reach by mid-century the net-zero emission consistent with 1.5 degrees Celsius. That is a very tall order and we are not doing well and 2021 will be a very critical make or break year, the deciding year.
There are several problems why this is going to be problematic. The first is that many of the stimulus that has been produced by the COVID-19 economies lack adequate green components. Vivid Economics found that in 14 out of 18 countries, spending that could negatively impact the environment outweighs the positives, and there is another study by 14 research groups on the energy sector that found that only 6 out of G20 nations are committing more public money to clean energy than to polluting sectors.

In many economies, stimulus funding will have a negative impact on the environment. This is true for Indonesia as well because the Indonesian COVID-19 budget has a lot on public health, education, poverty alleviation, and so on, but the green content is very much lacking and we need to do better.
• There is a very slow commitment by countries in delivering their NDC (Nationally Determined Commitments). Some 33 countries have stated their intention to update their NDC, 103 countries have stated their intention to enhance ambition or action in their NDC by 2020, and only 15 counties have submitted a 2020 NDC which represents 4.6% of global emissions.

• Also, things are moving too slow on sectoral challenges as well. If we want to achieve a 1.5-degree Celsius temperature rise or below that, we need to move 6 times faster with renewables, we need to move 20 times faster on electric vehicles, we need to phase out coal power 5 times faster, we need to use low carbon fuels 8 times faster, and we need to advance the electricity industry one and a half times faster and increase tree cover 5 times faster.

• 2021 will definitely be a critical year, we are really running out of time and we need to step up and catch up, and if we fail, we will end up with two degrees or a 3.2 degrees world, which is going to be catastrophic for everybody, and you cannot turn the clock back once you reach that point.

• For Indonesia, we do need to reactivate our climate efforts. We have not been very active. I am sorry to be honest about this, but we need to be clear on this.

• The problem is that in Indonesia the climate issue is still just a Ministerial issue, it is not a Presidential agenda. We have not raised our NDCs commitment and we need to really catch up and take the lead in climate diplomacy.
It is important to keep in mind that if we have a green stimulus it actually produces more jobs than otherwise. As the chart here shows, for every million dollars spent on investment, energy efficiency produces as many as 21 jobs whereas fossil fuels produce 6 jobs only — so 3 times more. This is also true for EV and public transport, tree planting, and so on. We need to really inform the public and the political elite of this paradigm that if we go green, you actually produce more jobs than fossil fuels would.

5. The Developing Countries, Especially Low Income Countries, Will Be at (Much) Greater Risks of Crisis, Conflict and Instability

- The impact of COVID-19 on the world economy has been very serious. Globally, we expect economic contraction of around 5%. The pandemic global economic cost in the next 2 years could reach 11 trillion dollars (larger than combined economies of Japan and Germany). WTO forecasts 9.2% decline in global trade. Covid-19 also erased 130 million jobs in first quarter and 400 million full time jobs in the second quarter.
- While the whole world is suffering, it is the developing countries that will be at much greater risks of crisis, conflict and instability. There are about 155 developing countries that are exposed to COVID-19 outbreak presently.
- The UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres has said that “the COVID-19 poses the greatest risks to developing countries” and later on he issued “an SOS, calling on G20 leaders to increase financial resources to IMF”. (The UN has warned of a “lost decade”. The IMF Kristalina Georgieva “the worse economic fallout since the
Great Depression"). Their projections are pretty grim. UNDP says developing countries could lose $220 billion dollars of income.

- UNDP also says that 100 million people will be pushed into extreme poverty — the first increase of poverty since 1998, of which 43 million in sub-Saharan Africa and 35 million in South Asia. On top of that, 207 million more could be pushed to extreme poverty due to severe long-term impact — bringing total number to more than a billion, according to study by UNDP. In Sub-Saharan Africa, COVID-19 could wipe out half of all jobs.
- There will also be more hungry people, and as we know, hungry people can become angry people. In November, World Food Program said that an additional 137 million people could face acute food insecurity by the end of 2020, which is an 82% increase from the pre-COVID-19 days (135 million people). Hungry people are angry people.
- Inequality will get worse. The amount of capital out of the emerging market that departed from emerging market was three times more the capital than from the 2008 financial crisis. Private sector debt is also going to the roof, exceeding GDP of 3 trillion dollars.
- Developing countries are at greater risk of not just having an economic crisis or recession, but also social crisis, conflict and instability.
- I trust that we can minimize some of the worst impacts of the COVID-19 crisis, because so far we have enough fiscal space and resources. But for sure, Indonesia will have a hard time attracting capital in 2021. And foreign markets for our exports, as well as tourism, will shrink.
- Indonesia should use its seat in the G20 to speak for the interest of the developing world.


- Religious, racial, social, and identity related tensions will rise next year. 2020 saw the Black Lives Movement emerging, growing, and spreading throughout some parts of the world. We also saw the cartoon crisis that agitated the Islamic world as a result of what happened in France.
- Certainly, things did not improve in terms of racial and religious social relations in 2020. Even President-elect Joe Biden affirmed that in the United States there is definitely institutional racism.
- So, my prediction is that these things — social, racial, religious and identity-related tensions — will get worse in 2021. Why? There are several factors.
- First, because there is still plenty of inherited bigotry around the world. We see this even in countries that are democratic, have rule-of-law, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, human rights, and so on. At the grassroots, you have still plenty of pockets inherited bigotry, meaning people who do not like other religions
or other kinds just because that is how they have been taught by their parents or by their community. We also see its symptoms in Indonesia.

This is a very interesting survey by PEW Research Center, conducted in 2016, and they found from their worldwide research that Christians are harassed or restricted by government or by non-government in 144 countries around the world. They also found that Muslims were harassed or restricted either by government or non-government entities in 142 countries around the world. And for Jewish people, which has much smaller community than Christians and Muslims, they are harassed or restricted by government or non-government entities in 87 countries. So the condition is not good globally at all at the grassroots, both in western and non-western countries.

This is a chart on the number of armed conflicts worldwide which are related to religious issue conflicts or religious identity conflicts. As you see from the chart, religious conflicts or religion-related conflicts worldwide are rising steadily, while non-religion conflicts are declining.

So inherited bigotry remains the breeding ground for intolerance or even worse actions including violent actions.

The second reason why things will get worse is that the prevalence of economic stress. Inequality has risen dramatically both in the developed world as well as in the developing world. This economic stress, inequality, joblessness and marginalization will lead to more expressions of discrimination or resentment of
• The others, either religious or social, and will lead in some cases to violent response.

• The third reason why social and religious tensions will rise is that there is increasing polarization in a lot of parts of the world, in developed countries as well as in developing countries. The United States, despite the election of President Biden will still remain a polarized place. Remember some 74 million people voted for President Trump. In Europe, in France, in the UK, in Eastern Europe, and so on, you see a quite high degree of polarization and this will add problems in terms of more social or religious related tensions.

• Lastly, there is also the rise of radicalism. The rise of radicalism means that they will be able to entice or galvanize people by exploiting certain issues. Radicalism always thrives in an environment of division, mistrust, fear and resentment. So the radicals will be more active and more creative next year in exploiting sensitive issues and in galvanizing support for their cause.

Keep in mind also that what has been happening recently in terms of terrorism is that there is high incidents of terrorist groups who attack only, exclusively, particular member of a religion and their house of worship. Meaning they do not go to a mall and bomb the mall, they do not go to a building and bomb a building, or shoot people on the street. They just go to a mosque, like in Christchurch, and just freely shot Muslims who were praying there. Or they go to a church in Sri Lanka and just bomb people, exclusively Christians who are praying at the church. Or they go to a synagogue in Germany and just shoot at the rabbi who is preaching there.
This is a new trend, and we saw this in Indonesia also recently. Remember we had a church in Surabaya that was bombed 3 years ago. Why? Because there were Christians worshipping in a church and that is the best place to find Christians.

So this is a very worrying trend of terrorism becoming less indiscriminate and more target-specific, more focused, more exclusive in targeting members of a particular religion worshipping in their house of worship. And this is why Indonesia’s interfaith efforts have to be stepped up and the present format of interfaith conferences are probably not adequate anymore because you just have the same people meeting over and over talking about the same things and the next day they return to their home and nothing happens at the grassroots. So we need to be more bold to do a push back against the possible rise of religious, racial, and social tensions and outbursts.

7. The “Big Thing” About Southeast Asia

Let me begin by this observation. In the Middle East, Turkey and Saudi Arabia are having a tussle. Saudi Arabia and Iran are always having a tussle, and then there are serious troubles in Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, among others. In Europe, there is military confrontation in Ukraine and a number of tension spots between Europe and Russia. Then you go to South Asia, you have this long-standing tension between India and Pakistan, and there is long festering conflict in Afghanistan. You jump to Northeast Asia and you see conflicts or troubled relations involving China and Japan, Japan and South Korea, China and South Korea, etc.

But then look at Southeast Asia. It is such a big thing that we do not have any of that, and few people appreciate it. Name two countries in our region that are in conflict with one another. Can’t find any? There used to be many. Indonesia hated Malaysia in the 1960’s. We wanted to invade and destroy Malaysia. Indonesia hated Singapore. Indonesia also did not have a good relationship with the new East Timor Republic. But now is totally different. All the countries in Southeast Asia are friends and part of the ASEAN family, and while they may have disputes, none have any conflictual relations.

It is such a luxury to be in a region where we can have this peaceful environment, relative to what is happening in other regions. Even in the South China Sea, the problem is manageable and containable, and ASEAN countries and China are sitting together to draft a Code of Conduct.

That is the “big thing” about our region, about where we live. I think Indonesians do not understand or appreciate that enough, and it is important to appreciate it because this region is our first line of defence. If our region is calm and cooperative, then we are good. But if the countries resent each other and fight against one another, we are going to be restless sleeping at night.
What Does This Mean for Indonesia

- Vaccine diplomacy will still be center-stage in 2021.
- While Indonesia always talks about an independent and active foreign policy, I think now we need to talk more, while remaining independent and active, about balance. Nothing will change in terms of active and independent foreign policy, but playing the balancing game in a complex, fragile, competitive, multipolar world, is where our diplomacy will be tested.
- There will be two temptations. First, the idea to hide and say, “let us just stay out of this madness”, and say we do not want to choose and if we just stay away, hopefully we will not get in trouble. Second, playing a role where we still do not choose sides, but exercising a more active role in doing what you can to produce a more cooperative pattern of relations among the conflicting great powers. We have done this in the past, and we can still do it again for now and in the future.
- I prefer the latter role for Indonesia. As a middle power, we have much more open space in the geostrategic chessboard. It is no longer enough for us to say passively “we don’t want to choose between the US and China”. Indonesia must have the confidence and grit to say to Washington DC and Beijing that there is enough space in Asia for both the US and China; that they must not bring their zero-sum rivalry to our region; that they must respect ASEAN centrality and apply the spirit of Treaty of Amity and Cooperation; that they must not try to divide the region or turn the region against a major power; that they must build trust and confidence; and that Indonesia and ASEAN can proactively facilitate for them potential areas of cooperation in Southeast Asia.
- Remember that the creation of ASEAN alone was not an American, Chinese or Soviet Union idea but a local home-grown idea. And the idea of ASEAN expanding from 6 to 10 countries, where before Vietnam was suspicious about ASEAN, happened because ASEAN countries especially Indonesia pushed hard for this to happen because we knew that it would change the region and the balance of power, which it did.
- But for balance to happen, for diplomatic activism to be effective, Indonesia needs to be a very strong sense of what we want, a realistic sense what we are capable of, and use our networks and resources to achieve those goals. There is neither time nor excuse for complacency.
- I have spoken too long, thank you for listening.
QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

H.E. Dr. Mohammad Azad, Ambassador of Iran to Indonesia commented:

- I think we can cooperate with other states to see if it is possible to have the same model, as you said, the ASEAN way, to have this model to be practiced in the Middle East, in my region. As you were mentioning, conflicts will increase. So we can discuss it, surely you know about the proposal by Dr. Zarif, the Iranian foreign minister, to have original dialogue, to have hope, different designs that we have ways, because of the big stake holders and soft powers, they are going to not materialize in this way. Maybe through the ASEAN way model, we can have a discussion and to find out how it will be for 2021 solutions for my region based on your practice and experience.
- I think that we can find other angles of discussion or dimensions in regards to vaccines, not only on the question of nationalism or the price of vaccines for all. The dimension that I am referring to is in the case of countries like us, we are under the unilateral sanctions and under maximum pressures by at least the Trump administration, we want to buy vaccines but there is no way to have it. I hope that in 2021 and with the new administration, we hope to have a global vaccine and to pay attention to humanity, otherwise it will be a crime against humanity in the developing countries.

Dr. Dino responded:

- The prerequisite for ASEAN to change our relationships in the beginning were two things. One is that it really took enormous guts to engage with Malaysia because of political tensions at that time. The government at that time were going against the natural instincts of the political environment at home at the time, which was very revolutionary. The question is, do the leaders in the Middle East have that courage to establish a new pattern of relationship.
- The second thing is forward thinking. I think what is special about ASEAN is the ability to not just be pragmatic, but also always look into the future and not the past. If anything can be learned from ASEAN, it is to be forward looking and having the courage to do what is not normally done.
- A career as a diplomat, sometimes we are preoccupied with national interests, confrontation, and rivalries which prevents us from seeing the humanitarian side of the crisis.

H.E. Ei Ei Khin Aye, Ambassador of Myanmar to Indonesia asked:

- I would like to know your thoughts on how our prospects are to reach the 2030 goals, and how the United Nations and the International community can contribute to the developing countries to reach the 2030 goals in time as targeted.
Dr. Dino answered:

- There is a blind spot in SDG, which is the fact that the issue of religious tolerance or Abrahamic peace is not a part of the SDG. The closest is on point 17 on democracy on Human Rights, but still does not quite cut it. And in our experience in Indonesia for example, in Ambon, people have been living together for centuries for peace, Muslims and Christians. And in 1999 they started killing one another, really badly, violence.
- Around the world, we can see the many possibilities of this interreligious strive within the Islamic world and outside it as well. The fact that there is so much bigger negativity on the grassroots of many religious communities. If this is not addressed, then development will not be sustainable, as the example of Ambon.
- COVID-19 now has given us a new impetus to reach things that would be in the benefit of SDGs, because now there is a lot more of a realization that you need to have more attention on inequality, marginalized parts of the economy, on so many things that would lead to the achievement of SDGs, but keep in mind that the UN said that there is a danger.
- We are going to face a loss decade on COVID-19. Loss decade means 10 years, which means we may not reach the SDGs if we have that loss in decade. This is why I really believe in the concept of the great reset, but unfortunately we have not seen much evidence to achieve the great reset that have been called for by many leaders.

H.E. Vegard Kaale, Ambassador of Norway to Indonesia asked:

- Regarding global democracy it has been under pressure for a while on many continents and this was actually discussed at the Bali democracy Forum last week and there are many indications that COVID-19 has put democracy and under even more pressure as the decision-making is happening on a short notice, it offers less transparency and there is less time for consultation and checks and balances. So do you have any reflections regarding the pandemic and will it represent a threat to democracies?
- Secondly, I would also like to add that getting access to the vaccines for everyone is a very high priority for my government, the Norwegian government, so we work hard at putting a lot of efforts into the institutions and initiatives you refer to both COVAX, CEPI, and also GAVI.

Dr. Dino answered:

- In many places there is a retreat from democracy or there is democracy but the quality of democracy is decreasing badly and this goes for example like in the United States. I think professor John Delury in one of our seminars said that the United States is now a sick man of democracy.
So it seems to be a trend but it is a matter of choice, it does not mean to deal with COVID-19 you have to enforce undemocratic measures. As we can see in many democracies like South Korea, New Zealand, and other places, they are doing very well dealing with COVID-19 without having to sacrifice on democratic efforts.

But what I do see is populism has taken a backseat in the time of COVID-19. Why? Because if you are a populist, and a demagogue, and what you do is scare people, and you lead a government, your people who are directly affected by COVID-19 are not going to take it lightly.

This is a time when citizens are very sensitive about their ruler. People who usually do not care about politics, who do not know who their politicians are, now they do. They are saying “hey, what are you doing? I do not have a job. Shops are closed, the economy is bad, what are you doing?” So those who do not have an answer will rely on populist rhetoric, they will lose.

I think a good example of a leader who is a populist but who is doing real work in my view is Ridwan Kamil in Indonesia. He was a populist before but he remains popular now because he stopped being populist and really concentrating on what is scientifically and evidence-based policy require for him to address the COVID-19 situation.

I think what will be interesting is President Biden’s idea to create a league of democracy. He has talked about how he wants to convene a Democracy Summit in the first probably a hundred days or so.

I will be honest with you, I think Asians will be careful what is the ambition of such a democracy. I say this because in 2001 or 2002, President Bush proposed the idea of Asia Pacific partnership for democracy and tried to ask Indonesia to join, to become like a co-leader of that movement. But we refuse politely because we thought the United States had just invaded Iraq and a country that just invaded another country is not a good example of a country that is trying to erect a democracy.

Secondly, we thought that if there is going to be any democracy movement, it should be from a local Asian rather than led by the United States. This is why we came up with the idea of Bali Democracy Forum.

But if the idea of the League of Democracy is to have an alignment of democracies to confront or fight non-democracies, I think that the Indonesian government and many Asians would be very reluctant to do that. But if the idea of the League of Democracies is “hey let’s strengthen our internal democracies, let’s help one another, and improve the quality of our democracies” then I think Indonesian and many Asians would be happy to be part of it.
Nino from Universitas Indonesia asked:

- Are there any issues that we have to wear off aside from the 7 things that you already explained? Probably, the 7 things you already explained is a tough call that you already selected. But are there some things that you eliminate from the 7 things?

Dr. Dino answered:

- The one thing that I was going to mention is mental health. Mental health is going to be a big thing because everybody is being affected, everybody is stressed out. People who lost their jobs and lost ones, I think that you know that I nearly died from COVID, and the stress that it produced for my family. My father got COVID, and my mom got COVID, and I swear I thought the world has crumbled.
- The thing is unfortunately, the government does not see it as a problem. If you look at the 175 trillion Rupiah for COVID recovery, see how much is reserved for psychological health or mental assistance. In Europe, they have that service now.
- Yes, vaccines are very important, but the government needs to help the young or stressed people with some facilities involving a lot of psychologists to help the nation from depression and other things. So I would say mental health is the thing to watch for.

Nada from Jakarta Globe asked:

- Can you elaborate more how Indonesia can play a more active role in 2021 with regards to US-China tension?

Dr. Dino answered:

- From diplomacy I moved to the think-tank world and I have been really surprised at how much barriers think tank people create for themselves. My idea is always whenever you have a problem you just have to talk to the people you have a problem with, that is the pragmatic thing to do.
- For example we do a track 1.5 event which is an informal dialogue between governments and think-tanks. Several times I offered “let's do China, let's get China in” and several times the answer is no “we cannot talk to China” and I asked why, I understand they have problems but isn’t it because you have a problem that you need to talk to them? Isn't it how we find solutions, how we narrow the perception gap and so on?
- I think Indonesia has the unique ability and placement, due to the fact that we are a strategic partner of China and the United States, to try to see if some change in the pattern of behaviour no matter how small can be done. For example, China and Japan are now working on a joint project in Thailand. They do not really agree
with one another but for some reason somebody got them to work together on a project and I think that this is quite powerful. It would be great if the United States and China were going to work on a project. And I thought, “hey, you know, this is quite powerful”.

- It would be great if the United States and China can work on a project. It may start small but it may change the texture of their relationship. China and the United States for example can work on North Korea where China has a lot of influence in Pyongyang and the United States, Japan, and South Korea have a lot of interests in the nuclear issue.

- Or China and the United States and Europe can develop a G3 relationship on climate change. If these three work together on climate change then that can be a game-changer. The G3 between the United States, China, and Europe and why not because their interests are aligned. But maybe Indonesia can be that party that can nudge them in that direction.

- I will tell you a little secret, FPCI has one ambition this year. Our ambition is to have a trilateral track 1.5 dialogue between Indonesia, United States, and China. I have offered this last year, nobody wanted to do it. I have offered it to my government and I said “hey let's do this” and they say it is not the time.

- But maybe 2021, FPCI is known to be very persistent. Remember we have convened the largest foreign policy conference in the world 10,000 people. If we did not believe in our capability then that would not happen. Remember we brought Obama to speak with us, who can bring Obama, it was an impossibility but we did it.

- I think it is an interesting idea and it is going to be one of our main projects next year and Insha’Allah it will happen. But you always have to think outside the box and you always have to think creatively. This is why I always say “Bebas-Aktif” is not enough. Independent and active foreign policy is not enough. You have to be creative because being independent is easy, being active is easy but it is the creative part that is the big challenge.

- But definitely I do believe Indonesia can play a role in trying to get some alteration to the relationship between the United States and China at least where the region is involved maybe not globally but something relating to regional affairs.

**Dickson Novenus from Binus University asked:**

- We all know that there is a good progress on vaccine development in Indonesia and other countries, but there are also some negative issues, especially in Indonesia there is a lot of information and negative perception towards vaccines from China, especially Sinovac. In your opinion, what can the government do to provide guarantee of security towards this issue?
Dr. Dino answered:

- The thing is we have to be clear that never mind if it is a Chinese, Russian, British, Indian, or Indonesian vaccine, it has to pass the BPOM test and WHO standard requirements. Because once you say “hey, that is the Chinese vaccine!” you would give in to stereotype tendencies that are not healthy. I do not mind a Chinese vaccine. I will take an Indonesian vaccine happily when it comes out, but let us make sure that it passes the scientific test.
- Let us be rational and open minded about it. I think what you need to know most is what is the success rate, how many shots that you need to get, know what technology it is, and then you make your decision. If the vaccines are free, you should not be worrying about the costs. I will make my choice after an intelligent study.