

Memories of Konfrontasi and Anti-Malaysia Sentiment in Indonesia

Benedictus Peter Sinar¹

¹ Master of International Relations & International Organizations

Faculty of Arts, University of Groningen

Corresponding author: petersinar@gmail.com

Received : Januari 2020; Accepted; April 2020 ; Published : Mei 2020

Abstract

Despite Malaysia and Indonesia having similarities in their religious practices, language, and shared ancestry, history has revealed that their relationship constantly fluctuates between peace and hostility. In this paper, we argued that Indonesia's collective memory of the konfrontasi era has triggered anti-Malaysian sentiment. To elaborate on the answer, first, the constructivism theory regarding identity and interest is used to define the Indonesian sentiment toward Malaysia. Indonesia has a negative sentiment towards Malaysia that distinct from Indonesia's sentiment to other countries. On its negative sentiment toward Malaysia, Indonesia often repeats the slogan of Ganyang Malaysia, which is the infamous slogan from the Konfrontasi era. This paper demonstrated that the 'false' collective memory created from the period of Konfrontasi had caused a negative sentiment towards Malaysia. Practically, the sentiment should also be reduced to prevent further escalation with Malaysia since there is already proof that the confrontative attitude toward Malaysia created more damage than the advantage.

Keywords: Indonesia, Malaysia, relationship, memory, and konfrontasi

Abstrak

Meskipun Indonesia dan Malaysia memiliki kesamaan dalam praktik agama, bahasa, dan kesamaan leluhur, sejarah telah mengungkapkan bahwa hubungan mereka terus berfluktuasi antara perdamaian dan permusuhan. Dalam tulisan ini, kami berpendapat bahwa ingatan kolektif Indonesia tentang era konfrontasi telah memicu sentimen anti-Malaysia. Untuk mengelaborasi jawabannya, pertama, teori konstruktivisme mengenai identitas dan kepentingan digunakan untuk mendefinisikan sentimen orang Indonesia terhadap Malaysia. Indonesia memiliki sentimen negatif terhadap Malaysia yang berbeda dengan sentimen Indonesia ke negara lain. Mengenai sentimen negatifnya terhadap Malaysia, Indonesia kerap mengulang slogan Ganyang Malaysia yang merupakan slogan terkenal dari era Konfrontasi. Makalah ini menunjukkan bahwa ingatan kolektif 'palsu' yang tercipta dari masa Konfrontasi telah menimbulkan sentimen negatif terhadap Malaysia. Praktisnya, sentimen juga harus dikurangi untuk mencegah eskalasi lebih lanjut dengan Malaysia karena sudah ada bukti bahwa sikap konfrontatif terhadap Malaysia lebih merugikan daripada menguntungkan.

Kata kunci: Indonesia, Malaysia, hubungan, memori, dan konfrontasi

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia and Malaysia have a long shared history, which has forged a close relationship that can be both warm and cold at times. Despite the two

countries having similarities in their religious practices, language, and shared ancestry (Budiawan, 2017), history has revealed that their relationship constantly fluctuates between peace and hostility. Indonesia's sentiment toward Malaysia can be seen through the Indonesian reaction towards problems with Malaysia. Even though Indonesia is at times also hostile towards other countries, they react differently towards Malaysia as compared to their dealings with other countries (Sunarti, 2013, p. 77). For instance, when dealing with the frequent problem of mistreatment of Indonesian migrant labor in countries like Saudi Arabia and Hong Kong, the negative sentiment this creates is far less intense than if the same were to occur in Malaysia.

The governments of both countries tend to solve their problems peacefully through diplomatic channels. However, Indonesian public sentiment is quickly enflamed and excessively when problems occur with Malaysia (Rohani Hj. Ab Ghani & Zulhilmi Paidi, 2011, p. 242). When a problem between two countries occurs, some Indonesians will hold demonstrations in front of the Malaysian embassy. Aside from acting emotionally, Indonesians used the "*ganyang* Malaysia" (crush Malaysia) slogan in their protest. This slogan is reproduced from the Old Order period when President Sukarno launched the same motto (Sunarti, 2013). On the other side, Malaysian attitudes are different from their counterpart. They show more calm reactions and assume the problem with Indonesia as a common problem since they believe that it can be solved diplomatically and peacefully (Kelana & Hara, 2009, p. 98).

From the frequent usage of the *ganyang Malaysia* slogan, it can be argued that the Indonesian public still remembers the memories of the period of konfrontasi. Therefore, in this paper, it is hypothesized that Indonesia's collective memory of *the konfrontasi* era has triggered anti-Malaysian sentiment. Concerning the hypothesis, the research questions that these paper postulates are: Why has the period of Konfrontasi created an anti-Malaysia sentiment in Indonesia? Meanwhile, sub-questions in this paper are: what kind of identity was tried to be built in the Sukarno era? Why is it necessary to build an identity of superiority as compared to Malaysia? Why are the memories of this antiquated identity of superiority still remembered in the modern era? How can the memories of this identity of superiority trigger the common negative sentiments towards Malaysia?

To elaborate on the answer, first, the constructivism theory regarding identity and interest is used to define the Indonesian sentiment toward Malaysia. Moreover, the theory about national identity will also be elaborated upon since Indonesia relies upon the national identity to unify its population. Afterward, the identity construction done by President Sukarno in the period of Konfrontasi with which national identity was constructed will be elaborated. The period of *Konfrontasi* or confrontation started in 1963 when Indonesia under Sukarno's era emphasized hostility in its dealings with a newly formed Malaysia Federation (Maksum & Bustami, 2014, p. 3). In this period, Sukarno

echoed the infamous slogan of *ganyang* Malaysia to raise the Indonesian spirit to fight against Malaysia.

Third, collective memories that arose in the period of *konfrontasi* will be linked with the present condition. Kelana and Hara stated that nowadays, the relation between Indonesia and Malaysia is marked by several issues, namely Indonesia Migrant Labor (known as Tenaga Kerja Indonesia or TKI), territorial disputes, and cultural heritage disputes (Rohani Hj. Ab Ghani & Zuhilmi Paidi, 2011). It will be demonstrated that past collective memories of Indonesia's supremacy over Malaysia are the source of the negative sentiments that arose whilst dealing with Malaysia on those central issues. However, Indonesia is now being forced to accept the fact that their perceived supremacy does not correspond to reality in particular cases. They are in some aspects, in fact, "beaten" by their counterpart; for instance, economically, nowadays, Indonesia is more impoverished than their neighbor in terms of per capita income (Ho, 2019, p. 27).

Finally, this paper aims to explain why the sentiment between the two countries exists. Rather than merely judge the sentiment as negative behavior such as "over-react"—without the intention to justify the sentiment—, the more in-depth understanding of the sentiment can illuminate the reasons behind such sentiment. Additionally, this topic is essential to be discussed because current Indonesian sentiment towards Malaysia can bring the actual hostility amongst citizens of the two neighboring countries, such as violence on football supporters. Therefore, to assuage the sentiment, the source of the sentiment should be adequately illuminated so that in the future, the negative sentiment can be reduced.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Identity and Expectation as the Source of Sentiment

The focus of this research is on the historical events that helped construct the current sentiments of Indonesia toward Malaysia. Constructivism is an appropriate theory to be used in this instance. Based on the constructivism perspective, an actor's behavior toward other actors can be determined by its intersubjective meaning influenced by its identity and interest (Wendt, 2008, p. 392). Constructivist also stated that identity and interest are not a static condition; instead, it can change and fluctuate over time; enemies in one period can be a friend at another time and vice versa. Thus, it can be concluded that identity and interest are shaped by history. Therefore history should be examined to provide us a deeper understanding of how the identity and interest of one actor shaped. The identity that can be owned by one country is the national identity. National identity can be utilized to enhance the feeling of togetherness and solidarity among the population.

The national identity is created by cultural ties, shared history, and shared vision of the future(Guibernau, 2004, p. 658).

In heterogeneous countries, a single national identity must be created and maintained to unify the diverse population. There are some strategies to develop single national identity namely national construction based on majority ethnic group; the use of symbol or ritual; the advancement of the socio-economy right, civil and legal right, and political right; common enemy; and strengthening national identity through the education system and the media(Guibernau, 2004). Indonesia, as a heterogeneous country, does not have an absolute majority group since Javanese, the largest ethnic group, only comprise around 40% of the population. The national construction based on Javanese identity will create favoritism that will cause minority jealousy. Indonesia also has seen a pronounced lack of improvement in the socio-economic, civil, legal, and political rights of its citizens. Therefore, the options for Indonesia in regards to national identity are limited to the creation of a symbol or ritual, creating a common enemy, and the propaganda of national identity through education and media. Thus, in the next sections, it will be shown that Sukarno was relying on the creation of a common enemy to unify the population, meanwhile, in the modern era, education helps to preserve the false memories of *konfrontasi*.

Moreover, self-identity, in this case, national self-identity, cannot exist without any comparison to other identities. Therefore, the process to determine one identity is also the proses of comparing ones' self with other entities(Larson, 2012, p. 63). Thus, countries often compare themselves with other countries to generate national identity. However, it is common practice to build an identity through comparison to other identities with shared characteristics, including culture, ethnicity, religion, or ideology. For instance, to formulate the individual identity, it is practical to compare the male soccer player with other male soccer players rather than compare him with a female soccer player or compare him with other occupations such as politicians.

As the source of comparisons to determine national identity, the shared identity with other countries can also bring a positive and negative attitude toward each other. Shared identity among countries can create stronger ties and closer cooperation among countries. Aside from the positive attitudes, shared identity can also create a sentiment and competition between countries with closed identities due to the desire to differentiate the identity and find uniqueness in their identity as the national identity. Since identity is compared continuously, it becomes vital for a country with a shared identity to form a sense of greatness in their identity compared to its counterpart. The establishment of greatness identity can be utilized to build the self-esteem and pride of the citizens, as Larson gives an example when the football club of the university win the competition, the students of the university are more proud to show their belongingness to the university by using their university uniform(Larson, 2012). Thus, the shared beliefs in the

community about the greatness of their nation compared to other countries is essential to be cultivated in order to maintain the unity of the countries, especially in a country with cultural diversity when the cultural identity is not sufficient to support the national unity.

Indonesia and Malaysia are a perfect example of countries that have shared identity. People in Indonesia and Malaysia were united by the shared identity as a Malay (Malay as a race; people with similar physical and social characteristics), the shared majority religion, and beliefs in the shared ancestry (which both countries were the part of old kingdoms such as Srivijaya and Majapahit). People from this land begun to be separated by the colonial power. Despite being separated by coloniality, two countries remain to interact with each other. After becoming separated countries, Indonesia and Malaysia still identify themselves as a part of Malay civilization (Sunarti, 2014, p. 74). The shared identity with Malaysia leads to a comparison of Indonesia's identity with its neighbor. Indonesia's greatness compared to Malaysia should be narrated to build public self-esteem as Indonesia is a culturally diverse country. The next chapters will discuss how is Indonesia's superior identity over Malaysia constructed in *Konfrontasi* and why Indonesia desires the superior identity over Malaysia. The utilization of national identity to enhance people's solidarity and loyalty will also be demonstrated in the next chapter.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

National Identity through *Konfrontasi*

After declaring its independence from Dutch colonial in 1945, Indonesia was struggling to unify hundreds of tribes and ethnicity in the Indonesian archipelago. As a multicultural country, Indonesia merely relied on the shared history to maintain its national identities without any single cultural identity to unify the population. It was narrated that Indonesia has shared history, in which Indonesia has been colonized by Dutch colonial power and have fought together against a common enemy. Therefore, it was crucial for Indonesia to find a single national identity that can consolidate all communities in the archipelago under one banner. The first attempt to construct the identity was through the creation of a shared ideology called Pancasila or five principles that give a conception about the Indonesian identity as the pluralistic society through the motto "*Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*" or "Unity in Diversity." Aside from Pancasila, the founding fathers also tried to unify Indonesia by determining Indonesia's national goals in UUD 1945 (known as Undang-undang dasar 1945 or 1945 constitution).

The ultimate goal of Indonesia's foreign policy stated in UUD 1945 is to guarantee world peace, which requires the Government to implement the '*free and active*' foreign policy platform. The foreign policy platform means that Indonesia can freely engage in diplomatic relations with any country

regardless of its block and actively enhance the peace and reduce the tension between two blocks(Windiani, 2010, p. 88). To manifest the Indonesia identity as the free and active actor in the international stage, first, Sukarno initiated the Bandung Conference (also known as Asia and Africa Conference) in April 1956. In the conference, the former western colonies in Asia and Africa were united and initiated an agreement to conduct foreign policy. Afterward, in 1961, to emphasize the freedom of Indonesia's foreign policy, Sukarno, with the four other countries (Egypt, Ghana, India, and Yugoslavia), initiated the non-align movement(A. S. Nugroho, 2016) to declare the neutral position of Indonesia on the cold war between two blocks.

Aside from accomplishing the mandate of UUD 1945, Indonesia's act to develop its political ties with the former colonies through Bandung Conference and non-align movement can be interpreted as an attempt of Indonesia to be affiliated with newborn countries. This practice is following the constructivist theories in which identities can be emerged and sustained through affiliation(Lebow, 2020, p. 109). The attempt to affiliate Indonesia with former western colonies can also be recognized when Sukarno created a dichotomy between New Emerging Forces (NEFOS) and Old Established Forces (OLDEFOS), which Indonesia identifies itself as the NEFOS(Sunarti, 2014). According to Sukarno's conception, NEFOS is a group of countries that comprise former western colonies from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Meanwhile, OLDEFOS is portrayed as the old imperialist western power. To gain a benefit with its affiliation with NEFOS, Sukarno tried to portray Indonesia as a prominent actor of NEFOS. It can be observed in Sukarno speech in 1964:

"The name of the Republic of Indonesia is so high, like a lighthouse, among the people of this world, especially among the New Emerging Forces, one proof that the world listens to the Republic of Indonesia."(A. Nugroho, 2015)

Since NEFOS has suffered from colonialism and imperialism, thus, the agenda of NEFOS is to fight against the (neo)colonialism and (neo)imperialism. Sukarno believed the NEFOS could fight against imperialist power if they were *berdikari* (self-sufficiency) and no longer rely on the colonialist and imperialist power. The portrayal of NEFOS identity and NEFOS agenda can be observed in Sukarno speech:

"If second Asia and Africa conference can take place..., Indonesia will recommend berdikari! To all the peoples of Asia and Africa, I said in Bogor, 'Bells of the death of imperialism is ringing. 'Because the essence of imperialism is to make nations not stand on their own feet."

As Indonesia perceives itself as a prominent actor in NEFOS, it means that Indonesia should become a leader in a fight against (neo)colonialism and (neo)imperialism. Therefore, Sukarno tried to construct Indonesia's identity as an anti-neo-colonialism and anti-neo-imperialism (*nekolim*) nation. To strengthen the identity of anti-*nekolim*, first, Sukarno ordered to nationalize all

Dutch and other foreign companies in Indonesia closely related to Sukarno's idea regarding *berdikari*. Afterward, Sukarno ordered to liberate the last Dutch territory in Dutch East Indies, namely West Papua or Dutch New Guinea. In order to liberate West Papua from a colonial power, Indonesia launched the People's Threefold Command (known as Tri Komando Rakyat or Trikora) operation¹. The result of Trikora's operation was the success of Indonesia to force Dutch to settle the dispute over West Papua in the New York Agreement in August 1962.

Even though Indonesia had benefited from anti-*nekolim* identity since it can unify the population by the common enemy (Dutch and western power), the anti-*nekolim* identity also created disadvantages for Indonesia. The *berdikari* policy has been proven to fail to create substantial economic growth for Indonesia; instead, Indonesia was hit by recession and skyrocketed inflation after foreign companies had been nationalized. These circumstances trigger the rebellion in some parts of Indonesia, such as the Revolutionary Governance of the Republic of Indonesia (known as Pemerintahan Revolusioner Republik Indonesia or PRRI/Permesta) in 1958 and Islamic Military of Indonesia (known as Darul Islam/Tentara Islam Indonesia or DI/TII) (Doeppers, 1972, p. 183). Therefore, to maintain the unity of population and camouflage the economic backwardness, Indonesia needs another common enemy that can be labeled as part of (neo) colonialism and (neo)imperialism to bolster Indonesia's national identity as an anti-*nekolim* nation.

Indonesia views Malaysia as a potential common enemy since Sukarno believed that Malaysia was a puppet state of the British. Through his speech, Sukarno attempted to link Malaysia with the (neo)colonialism and (neo)imperialism:

"Malaysia, are you purely independent (berdikari)? Absolutely not! If (Malaysia) want a non-stop defense, (Malaysia) can ask help from Britain,... Australia,... New Zealand."

Sukarno's speech depicts Malaysia as a country that relies its security on the British and acts in accordance with British commando. The presence of the British army in Malaysia is perceived as a threat to Indonesia since Sukarno was suspicious that the British had an agenda to besiege Indonesia from all directions (Malaysia in the North and Australia in the South). The attempt to relate Malaysia with Britain can be interpreted as an attempt to portrayed Malaysia's 'child' of neo-imperialism and neo-colonialism that had an agenda to maintain and spread western influence in Southeast Asia. This hateful

¹1961-1962. With its military might and Uni Soviet assistance, Indonesia successfully pushed Netherland to discussed the West Papua dispute in New York Agreement in August 1962. Sunarti (2014), 75

perception of Malaysia helped to start Indonesia's hostile and confrontative attitude towards Malaysia.

At the peak of their hostility, Indonesia's Foreign Affairs Minister, Dr. Subandrio, officially announced the beginning of the era of *Konfrontasi* in January 1963 (Maksum & Bustami, 2014) by the announcement of Indonesia. The *konfrontasi* was narrated occurred because of the disagreement of Indonesian with the formation of the Malaysia Federation. Indonesia believed the Malaysia Federation is a British puppet state. President Soekarno, who was the strong opponent of colonialism, viewed the creation of the Malaysia Federation by British an attempt from neo-colonialist and neo-imperialist to widen their influence in Southeast Asia. Because of the inevitable increase in the tension and hostility between Indonesia and Malaysia, in May 1964, with his famous speech and slogan of "*Ganyang Malaysia*," Sukarno launched the campaign of People's Twofold Commands (*Dwikora*) (Budiawan, 2017) to do an ambush over Malaysian territories, which was inspired by the success of operation *Trikora*. Those two commands consist of the order to strengthen Indonesia's defense; and help the revolutionary struggle of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, Sabah, and Brunei to dissolve the establishment of the puppet state of Malaysia. Nevertheless, historians also see another motive behind the launching of *Dwikora's* operation. *Dwikora* is seen as President Sukarno's rhetoric to create a common enemy to unify Indonesia's mass since Indonesia faced the economic crisis and separatist movement in the same period (Budiawan, 2017).

Sukarno's motives to utilize *Dwikora* and anti-Malaysia sentiment as the unifier for the population being hit by economic crisis can be noticed in Sukarno speech regarding Malaysia:

"If we are hungry, it is normal. If we are embarrassed, that is also normal. However, if we are hungry or embarrassed because of Malaysia (that is) impertinent!... Recall all corners of the country that we will unite to fight this humiliation."

From the speech, it can be interpreted that Sukarno tried to downgrade the problem of poverty and exaggerate the escalation with Malaysia to unify the population by blaming Malaysia as the source of poverty in Indonesia. The utilization of Malaysia as a common enemy can also be seen in the sudden change in Indonesia's attitudes towards Malaysia. President Sukarno showed his earlier support to the plan on liberating the British colonial area in North Borneo and Malaya Peninsula. Nevertheless, after Indonesia did not longer have a problem regarding West Papua (Wardhani, 1999, p. 28), Indonesia started the *konfrontasi* with Malaysia.

The confrontation with Malaysia had negatively impacted Indonesia's economy, mainly because of the dissolution of trading ties with Malaysia. Since Indonesia's authority banned all the imported goods from Malaysia, people who lived near the Malaysian border, such as in the Riau Islands, were suffered the most as they obtained almost all commodities from Malaysia (Perdana,

Melay, & Kamaruddin, 1966, pp. 4–5). This miserable condition means that Indonesia needed another national identity to consolidate the population. As inhabitants closed to Malaysia are ethnic Malay, which has more similarities with Malaysia, the superior Indonesian identity over Malaysia is needed. The creation of a superior identity was also necessary to be created to maintain the morale of combatants since Trikora's operation had not been fruitful where Malaysia could easily intercept Indonesian ambush over Malaysian territories. To compensate for the failure of *Konfrontasi*, Sukarno narrated *Konfrontasi* as the proof of Indonesian bravery to act boldly against any foreign threats (Budiawan, 2017):

“We are currently under siege... Malaya, Singapore,..., North Kalimantan are base of British military power! And I tell you, Britain now wants to strengthen the southern island² too. So, our northern part is under siege, and our southern is under siege. But we do not ask for help from other countries, other nations. Hey, we are under siege, ask for help ... No!”

The speech can be interpreted as an attempt to compare Indonesia with Malaysia on their self-independence (*berdikari*) from their former colonists. Indonesia was perceived as a brave and independent nation that fought any threat with its power; meanwhile, Malaysia was depicted as a puppet state of British, which relies its security on the power of British and other Commonwealth countries. Also, the narratives regarding the process on how Malaysia receives its independence from the British have strengthened Indonesia's image as a brave and powerful nation. Malaysia perceived as a nation that merely gained its independence peacefully from succession and remained to rely its security on its former colonist after its independence. Therefore, Malaysia is depicted as the submissive nation compared to Indonesia. Furthermore, the way Malaysia received its independence was compared to how Indonesia acquire its independence from Netherland. Indonesia perceived as a brave fighter nation to fight for their independence by their struggle and rebellion against Dutch colonists. Therefore, in the *Konfrontasi* era, Indonesia was portrayed as having more self-sufficiency and more bravery compared to Malaysia.

Contemporary Condition and The Memory of *Konfrontasi*

After the *Konfrontasi* era, Indonesia normalizes its relation with Malaysia and develop the blood brotherhood relation because of identity similarities. However, in a closer and more peaceful relationship, Indonesia and Malaysia remain involved in some dispute. It is argued that in the modern era, Indonesia and Malaysia's relationship is marked with three significant

² Refers to Australia

issues: territorial dispute, cultural heritage dispute, and Indonesia Migrant Labors (TKI) protection. Those three major issues often result in the anti-Malaysia protest and demonstration that end with the repetition of the *Ganyang* Malaysia slogan. In almost all major problems, Indonesia has experienced humiliating defeat against Malaysia. In the TKI case, Indonesia often humiliated by the domestic violence experienced by TKI that works as the household assistant and the inability to protect their TKI abroad. For instance, in 2018, Adelina, TKI, who works as household assistance, has been tortured to death by her master. According to the Indonesian online news portal, the perpetrator (Adelina's former master) has been sued with the death penalty; nevertheless, in 2019, the perpetrator was acquitted from all lawsuits(BBC, 2019). Moreover, Indonesia's most humiliating defeat over Malaysia is the failure of Indonesia to preserve its sovereignty over the Sipadan and Ligitan Islands. These two small islands have been on dispute since the Suharto era, but, in 2002, two countries agreed to settle the dispute on the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The result from ICJ was stunned Indonesia, as Indonesia should lose control over the islands(Rohani Hj. Ab Ghani & Zulhildi Paidi, 2011). Indonesia has had success over Malaysia merely on the cultural heritage dispute.

Aside from the major issues, in other aspects, Indonesia also has inferiority over Malaysia since Malaysia has a more advanced development than Indonesia. For instance, in the economic aspect, the GDP per capita of Malaysia is tripled to Indonesia GDP per capita. However, Indonesia has a bigger total GDP due to a bigger population. The higher prosperity in Malaysia also becomes a reason for Indonesia to send its TKI that often perceive as the poor, low wages, and indiscipline worker by its Malaysian master. Thus, Indonesia is now often portrayed as a poor cousin of Malaysia(Clark, 2013, p. 396).

Therefore, it is obvious that nowadays, Indonesia has inferiority in the term of politics and economy over Malaysia. Furthermore, according to Erika Harris, the military, political, and economic backwardness in the present can be compensated by the story of the past gloriousness. In other words, "...*the sense of national inferiority is camouflaged...*" by the glories in the past even though the glories in the past is merely a 'myth' to inspire people(Harris, 2009, p. 27). The narrative about *konfrontasi* can be said as a myth since there is a gap between narrated history in educational literature and the actual event of *Konfrontasi*. Indonesians understand the *Konfrontasi* as a period of braveness and heroism of Indonesia to act boldly against Malaysia. However, the utilization of *Konfrontasi* to disguise the severe economic crisis in the Sukarno era has never been taught in school(Budiawan, 2017).

Since the public misunderstands the *Konfrontasi*, the collective memories in *Konforntasi* merely repeated the creation of a superior identity over Malaysia. Thus, in any protest that brings the '*Ganyang* Malaysia' slogan, it can be interpreted as the attempt to recall collective memories regarding

Indonesia's greatness identity under *Konfrontasi*. The superior or higher status identity is remains needed by Indonesia to compensate for the inferiority over Malaysia and to maintain the sense of pride and solidarity among the population. This romance of the past can camouflage the inferiority by promising the unchanged traits from the past(Harris, 2009). The identity of pure independence (*berdikari*) and an unfear fighter nation (by comparing how Malaysia received its independence), which are recalled from the past, are national traits to be honored. Those traits are believed as the Indonesian's advantage, which Malaysia does not have so. This self-conception regarding national superiority in terms of *berdikari*-ness and bravery is utilized to outweigh the inferiority in economics, political, and other aspects.

Besides comforting the public from the inferiority, the identity collected from the past can also trigger the sentiment. Since identity generates expected role and expected reciprocal threats from others(Larson, 2012), the memories of Indonesia greatness created from *Konfrontasi* have made the expectation that Indonesia can handle the problem with Malaysia easily. It also means that Indonesia deserves to receive respectful treats from Malaysia. However, the humiliation from Malaysia in some issues demonstrates the unfulfilled expectation regarding how Malaysia should treat Indonesia. This condition has created a gap between reality and expectation, where in reality, Indonesia is unable to handle some issues against Malaysia and should admit its defeat over Malaysia meanwhile in expectation, Indonesia has an imagination of greatness create a sense that Malaysia could respect it and any affairs with Malaysia should result in the glory of Indonesia. Thus, the sentiment that emerged in the modern era is mainly resulted from Indonesia's disappointment because of the unfulfilled expectation regarding its superior identity over Malaysia.

CONCLUSION

Indonesia has a negative sentiment towards Malaysia that distinct from Indonesia's sentiment to other countries. On its negative sentiment toward Malaysia, Indonesia often repeats the slogan of *Ganyang* Malaysia, which is the infamous slogan from *the Konfrontasi* era. This paper demonstrated that the 'false' collective memory created from the period of *Konfrontasi* had caused a negative sentiment towards Malaysia. Accompanied by the use of the constructivism theory regarding identity, specifically the construction of national identity, it becomes more apparent that the superior identity compared to Malaysia generated in *Konfrontasi* is a source of the sentiment.

Initially, the *Konfrontasi* was the attempt to hide the backwardness of public affairs, such as the economy and rebellion, by portraying Malaysia as a common enemy. Malaysia was designed as a common enemy to maintain the anti-*nekolim* identity after the Dutch colonial power had left entirely from the

former Dutch East Indies territories. However, through the historical narrative in educational literature, the memories of konfrontasi have created the 'myth' of Indonesian superiority traits over Malaysia, such as braveness and *berdikariness*. Despite being understood in bias by the Indonesian public, the false public memories about *Konfrontasi* is still strongly remembered. The glories in the past are utilized as compensation for Indonesia's backwardness in the economy, politics, and other fields compared to Malaysia. The memories of 'false' superior identity can trigger the sentiment in the modern era because of the expectation that created from it. The expectation comprises what role the country should play and how they should be treated by other countries. The gap between inferior reality and superior self-image is a source of the sentiment toward Malaysia since it can create the unfulfilled expectation regarding how Malaysia should treat Indonesia.

Since the sentiment is triggered by a 'myth' of superior identity in konfrontasi, it is necessary to rewrite the more accurate narrative about *Konfrontasi*. Public awareness about the objective narrative of Konfrontasi and the negative effect of the sentiment should be cultivated; thus, the sentiment can be reduced, and the Indonesian public can receive an accurate picture of today's identity and condition. The assuagement of sentiment is also essential to reduce the government camouflage from the actual issues. As media censorship is no longer exists in Indonesia, the Government can no longer do the propaganda and censor the bad news from the public. Thus, to camouflage the failure of the Government to protect its citizens and its territories can only be blamed to Malaysia by raising the sentiment. It is needed to assuage the sentiment to enhance the Indonesian public's criticism to critics their Government rather than blame Malaysia; thus, the Government can revise its policy to protect its citizens and territories and intensify their development. The sentiment should also be reduced to prevent further escalation with Malaysia since there is already proof that the confrontative attitude toward Malaysia created more damage than the advantage.

REFERENCE

- BBC. (2019). Kasus Adelina: Pengadilan bebaskan majikan “penyiksa TKW”, anggota parlemen Malaysia sebut “keputusan tragis.”
- Budiawan. (2017). How do Indonesians remember Konfrontasi? Indonesia–Malaysia relations and the popular memory of “Confrontation” after the fall of Suharto. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 18(3), 364–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2017.1345349>
- Clark, M. (2013). The politics of heritage: Indonesia-Malaysia cultural contestations. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 41(121), 396–417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2013.804979>
- Doepfers, D. F. (1972). An Incident in the PRRI / Permesta Rebellion of 1958. *Indonesia*, 14(14), 182–195.
- Guibernau, M. (2004). Nation Formation and National Identity. *Belgisch*

- Tijdschrift Voor Nieuwste Geschiedenis/ Revue Belge de Histoire Contemporaine*, 34(4), 657–682.
- Harris, E. (2009). Ideological Foundations of Nations and Nationalism. In E. Harris (Ed.), *Nationalism: Theories and Cases* (pp. 21–45). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Stable.
- Ho, Y. C. (2019). Making Sense of a Special Relationship. In *Special Relationship in the Malay World* (pp. 11–56). <https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814818193-006>
- Kelana, M., & Hara, A. E. (2009). Quo-vadis Keakerabatan Malaysia-Indonesia ? *Jurnal Komunikasi Massa*, 2(2), 97–111.
- Larson, D. W. (2012). How Identities Form and Change: Supplementing Constructivism with Social Psychology. In *Psychology and Constructivism in International Relations* (pp. 57–75). Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Lebow, R. N. (2020). Affiliations, Bodies, Biographies. In *National Identities and International Relations* (pp. 107–144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316710982.006>
- Maksum, A., & Bustami, R. (2014). The 1965 coup and reformasi 1998: Two critical moments in Indonesia-Malaysia relations during and after the Cold War. *SpringerPlus*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-3-45>
- Nugroho, A. (2015). Pidato Bung Karno Ganyang Malaysia.
- Nugroho, A. S. (2016). Soekarno Dan Diplomasi Indonesia. *Sejarah Dan Budaya : Jurnal Sejarah, Budaya, Dan Pengajarannya*, 10(2), 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um020v10i22016p125>
- Perdana, I., Melay, R., & Kamaruddin. (1966). Indonesia-Malaysia Confrontation In 1963-1966 (The Economic Impacts on Society in Tanjung Balai Karimun), 1966(082169057293), 1–14.
- Rohani Hj. Ab Ghani, & Zuhlilmi Paidi. (2011). Malaysia-Indonesia : Pengalaman Hubungan Dua Negara Serumpun. *Seminar on National Resilience*, 223–246.
- Sunarti, L. (2013). Menelusuri Akar Konflik Warisan Budaya antara Indonesia dengan Malaysia. *SOSIOHUMANIKA: Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Sosial Dan Kemanusiaan*, 6(1), 77–88.
- Sunarti, L. (2014). Politik Luar Negeri Malaysia terhadap Indonesia , 1957-1976 : Dari Konfrontasi Menuju Kerjasama. *Jurnal Kajian Sejarah & Pendidikan Sejarah*, 2(1), 65–80.
- Wardhani, B. L. S. W. (1999). Indonesia-Malaysia Relations in the Post-Confrontation Era : the Role of the Serumpun Concept. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, 12(3), 25–44.
- Wendt. (2008). Anarchy is what States Make of it : The Social Construction of Power Politics Author (s) : Alexander Wendt Published by : The MIT Press

Stable URL : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706858>. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391–425.

Windiani, R. (2010). Politik Luar Negeri Indonesia dan Globalisasi. *POLITIKA*, 1(2), 88–98. https://doi.org/10.30965/9783846763841_010