

Collective Food Security under the Framework of the ASEAN Community: A Reflection from Indonesia's Food Policy*

Gautama Budi Arundhati,** Muhammad Bahrul Ulum***, Rosita Indrayati***

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v6n1.a1>

Submitted: November 22, 2018 | Accepted: April 23, 2019

Abstract

Since its inception in 1967, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has been based upon the common interests of its member states and the principle of solidarity. These two cornerstones have played an important role in the efforts for development of this regional organization. Under the principle of solidarity, ASEAN configures a distinct intergovernmentalism subjected to collective decision-making which emphasizes common understanding, including on how it approaches security concerns. This article aims to discuss and analyze the prospect of the collective food security in ASEAN by taking into account the legal frameworks of food security in the ASEAN community and Indonesia. Specifically, this article reflects the development of ASEAN and the member states' common problem of providing food for national consumption. ASEAN's development shows that it has committed to food security. For instance, ASEAN signed the Agreement on the ASEAN Food Security Reserve. However, this institution has not paid enough significant attention to food security and the ASEAN integration pillars are often justified to exempt food security amongst its priorities. Therefore, this article clarifies that food security is an essential part of the pillars. By the inclusion of food security to such pillars and taking account of Indonesia's experiences, there is an importance for ASEAN to reconsider food security. This consideration is not only to achieve part of its ultimate objectives to bring prosperity but also to ensure regional stability.

Keywords: ASEAN community, food security, principle of solidarity.

Ketahanan Pangan Kolektif dalam Kerangka Komunitas ASEAN: Sebuah Refleksi dari Kebijakan Pangan Indonesia

Abstrak

Sejak didirikan pada 1967, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) berlandaskan pada kepentingan bersama para negara anggota dan prinsip solidaritas. Kedua landasan

PADJADJARAN Journal of Law Volume 6 Number 1 Year 2019 [ISSN 2460-1543] [e-ISSN 2442-9325]

* The authors would like to express their gratitude to Eleanor C. Jones (Saint Mary's College) for her comments and helpful proofreading to the final manuscript.

** Lecturer of Law, Universitas Jember, Jl. Kalimantan 37, Jember, S.H. (Universitas Jember), LL.M. (Radboud University Nijmegen), arundhati_rev_gb@yahoo.co.id.

*** Lecturer of Law, Universitas Jember, Jl. Kalimantan 37, Jember, S.H. (Universitas Jember), LL.M. (Osmania University), muhd.bahrul@unej.ac.id.

*** Lecturer of Law, Universitas Jember, Jl. Kalimantan 37, Jember, S.H. (Universitas Jember), M.H. (Universitas Airlangga), rosita_indrayati@unej.ac.id.

utama ini memainkan peran penting dalam upaya pembangunan organisasi regional ini. Berdasarkan pada prinsip solidaritas, ASEAN membentuk sebuah kelembagaan intergovernmental yang berbeda dengan keputusan kolektif yang menekankan pada pemahaman bersama, termasuk dalam kaitannya bagaimana organisasi ini menyikapi urusan ketahanan. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk mendiskusikan dan menganalisis prospek ketahanan pangan kolektif di ASEAN dengan mempertimbangkan kerangka hukum ketahanan pangan di komunitas ASEAN dan Indonesia. Artikel ini secara spesifik merefleksikan perkembangan ASEAN dan permasalahan bersama pada negara-negara anggotanya dalam penyediaan pangan untuk memenuhi konsumsi nasional. Perkembangan ASEAN menunjukkan bahwa terdapat komitmen mengenai ketahanan pangan. Misalnya, ASEAN telah melakukan penandatanganan Perjanjian Cadangan Ketahanan Pangan ASEAN. Namun, institusi ini tidak begitu menunjukkan keseriusan terhadap ketahanan pangan dan pilar-pilar integrasi ASEAN seringkali dijustifikasi untuk mengecualikan ketahanan pangan dalam ke dalam daftar prioritas. Oleh karena itu, artikel ini mengklarifikasi bahwa ketahanan pangan sebenarnya sudah tercakup di dalam pilar-pilar tersebut. Dengan dimasukkannya ketahanan pangan dan belajar dari pengalaman Indonesia, ASEAN perlu mempertimbangkan kembali pentingnya ketahanan pangan. Atas pertimbangan tersebut, hal ini dimaksudkan dalam rangka mencapai bagian dari tujuan utama ASEAN yang tidak hanya untuk mewujudkan kesejahteraan tetapi juga memastikan stabilitas regional.

Kata kunci: komunitas ASEAN, ketahanan pangan, prinsip solidaritas.

A. Introduction

As the commodity directly contributing to people, food has an important role in the sustainability of humankind. By considering the words of Sukarno, the first president of Indonesia, food is the matter of death and survival of Indonesia as a nation.¹ Though Sukarno justified the importance of food in the Indonesian context, it has a general application. This importance is subsequently emphasized in the achievement targets of the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which include the reduction of world hunger as a common problem in the international arena.² Food is also a common and problematic issue for ASEAN countries, especially those that produce large amounts of food but consume it in large numbers, such as Indonesia, the Philippines, and Malaysia. This fact confirms that food is not a mere domestic problem but a shared problem; therefore, this issue requires a large framework to address it. This article justifies the need to discuss the importance of regional framework under ASEAN economic integration.

Along with the integration of the ASEAN Economic Community in early 2016, ASEAN's vision in the economic field is to realize ASEAN as a hub for a competitive

¹ Achmad Suryana, "Menelisik Ketahanan Pangan, Kebijakan Pangan, dan Swasembada Beras" *Pengembangan Inovasi Pertanian*, Vol. 1 No. 1, 2008, p. 1.

² Iwan Hermawan, "Analisis Perdagangan Beras dan Ketahanan Pangan di Negara-Negara Asia Tenggara" *Jurnal Politica*, Vol. 4 No. 2, 2013, p. 163.

production subjected to the free flow of goods, services, capital, investment, and skilled workers. This production includes the food and agriculture fields. In the food sector, this article considers geographical factors that allow ASEAN members to be agricultural countries and how ASEAN has the potential to be included as the hub for agricultural production. To this extent, the inclusion of agricultural sector in ASEAN will greatly contribute to improving comparative advantage on a regional scale.

Hitherto, such potential does not appear to be sustainable. This is indicated by a series of problems due to the domestic administration system. These problems emerge as a result of food liberalization that significantly allows private actors to add an important position in the food market, while the management of domestic food production is poor resulted in the dependence on food imports. For example, Indonesia changed the policy from food self-sufficiency into food security as a result of food liberalization which enabled imports as the main alternative to overcome domestic food problems.³ Therefore, the data shows that the imported rice to Indonesia reached 9%, the Philippines reached 10%, and Malaysia reached 30% of the total domestic average needs.⁴ This data confirms that food is actually a common problem that needs to be addressed at the regional level, as well as an adhesive instrument for the realization of member solidarity towards the ASEAN single market.⁵

Essentially, ASEAN formulated a vision and strategic plan applied from 2016 until 2025, based on food, agriculture and forestry cooperation to support single market objectives that will play an important role in global economic integration. Based on the contribution of Southeast Asian imports to 14.72% of the world market, efforts to support these goals become increasingly important to the implementation. Efforts to harmonize the standardization of security, infrastructure, and trade in food are being formulated, but each member country also protects the domestic agricultural sector from international economic competition in response to instability in food prices. These episodes assert that there are two conflicting ideas in realizing collective food security at the ASEAN level: self-sufficiency and self-reliance in food. These conflicting ideas resulted in the lack of food policy at the ASEAN level.

This article is divided into three parts. The first part of this article will discuss the position of Indonesia in ASEAN and it will be followed by the discussion on

³ Muhammad Bahrul Ulum, "Pancasila dalam Arus Liberalisasi Pangan Pascareformasi" in Al Khanif, Mirza Satria Buana, and Manunggal Kusuma Wardaya (eds.), *Pancasila Dalam Pusaran Globalisasi*, Yogyakarta: LKIS, 2017, p. 318.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 319; David Charles Dawe, Piedad Moya, and Cheryll B Casiwan, "Why Does the Philippines Import Rice? Meeting the Challenge of Trade Liberalization", *International Rice Research Institute*, 2006, p. xiv.

⁵ Gautama Budi Arundhati, "Dinamika Relasi Antara Prinsip Non-Interference dan Prinsip Solidaritas ASEAN", *Era Hukum Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum*, Vo. 1, No. 1, 2017, p. 114.

taking account of Indonesia's national food security and how it represents domestic concerns within the ASEAN member states. In the second part, this article will examine food security in the process of the ASEAN community integration. The last part of this article will revisit the concept of integration on food security at the ASEAN level.

B. Indonesia's Position in ASEAN

In 2016, ASEAN contributed 6.8 percent of total world trade and received 5.8 percent of the world's foreign direct investment inflows. These percentages confirm the strategic role of ASEAN at the intersection of world trade, but this essentially lies in its substance. This potential is a result of factors such as favorable demographics, urban flows, low levels of national debt, abundant natural resources, and close relations to energy producing countries like China and India. The diversity of ASEAN, both between and within countries, results in challenges and opportunities in business. In fact, the ASEAN community continues to develop a harmonious economic market to achieve lasting growth and prosperity throughout the region.⁶ This shows that ASEAN is a highly regarded economy due to its regional success to gradually solve problems in each member country.

An important reason behind ASEAN's success was Indonesia's attitude. As the largest country, with a population of more than 40 percent of ASEAN, it is considered the largest role of Indonesia to shape the face of ASEAN. Because of the country's large size, Indonesia could have intervened with ASEAN. However, Indonesia's wisdom drove Suharto, Indonesia's second president, to invite smaller countries to lead ASEAN and such a tradition was subsequently followed by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. In the era of Joko Widodo, the president heavily considers national economic development and, subsequently, he shows enthusiasm for ASEAN.⁷ It also notes Megawati's administration with her Foreign Minister, Hassan Wirajuda. During this time, ASEAN was driven to be more integrated within three communities: the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC), the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) and Indonesia Socio-Cultural Community. In fact, Indonesia's attitude was committed to the establishment of ASEAN integration as outlined on August 16, 1966.⁸

Such communities, however, resulted in controversies against sovereignty. Regarding these topics, Joko Widodo's administration often quoted Sukarno's 1963 speech in which the Indonesian people must be politically sovereign,

⁶ Australian Trade and Investment Commission (Austrade), "Introduction", <https://www.austrade.gov.au/asean-now/introduction/>, accessed on August 2018.

⁷ Kishore Mahbubani and Jeffery Sng, *Keajaiban ASEAN: Penggerak Perdamaian*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2017, pp. 209-210.

⁸ CPF Luhulima in Faudzan Farhana and Hayati Nufus, *Kita dan ASEAN: Ayo Berlari Bersama*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2016, p. 7.

economically independent, and socially and culturally personable. Such a literal meaning may appear to be a contradiction with the idea of integration. On the one hand, there is an open market. On the other hand, Indonesia wants to establish a domestic economy and reflects the period of agitation against liberalization. In other words, liberalization was accused as the enemy of states due to the open market contributed to the negation of economic resilience.⁹ However, in the current context, such an assumption cannot be ignored because liberalization is inevitable. In fact, as a result of an unfair economic and trade system, liberalization has resulted in deindustrialization in several developing countries. An example of this is Indonesia's industrial textiles, which have been unable to compete with China's industrial textiles both in terms of price and quality. This deindustrialization also includes the competition over agricultural products which resulted in deteriorating poverty statistics in Indonesia.¹⁰ This makes sense because the Indonesian government currently focuses on the commitment to sovereignty. In addition, it considers the opening market of ASEAN. Yet, with the following attitude, it must be clear that the regional cooperation in the context of free trade agreed upon in the ASEAN Economic Community a means to lead to a more prosperous society both at the national and regional levels.

It is essential to note, apart from the aforementioned arguments above, Indonesia is the world's third-largest democracy after India and the United States. To this, Indonesian democracy is indicated as a democracy through the application of a multi-party, open election system. This is in spite of the introduction of decentralization granting powers over resources up to the provincial and regency or city levels.¹¹ Such facts confirm that Indonesia has sufficient capital to be a key player in the region by considering strengthening the rule of law at the national level therefore correlatively leveraging to the regional level.

In addition, there have been Indonesian values that come into discussion in the ASEAN forum, i.e. deliberation (*musyawarah*) and consensus (*mufakat*). Currently, such values are appreciated by many people and endorsed at the regional level as the "ASEAN Way." The "ASEAN Way" has helped countries such as Myanmar to achieve a peaceful transition from decades of violent military rule, while countries

⁹ Andreas Maryoto, "Diplomasi Cerdik-Membuka Pasar, Memperhatikan yang Tertinggal", in Tim Redaksi Kompas, *Tinjauan Kompas Menatap Indonesia 2015 Antara Tantangan dan Harapan*, Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas, 2015, pp. 39-40.

¹⁰ Roby Arya Brata, *Membangun Integritas, Akuntabilitas, dan Efektivitas Pemerintahan*, Depok: Pustaka Kemang, 2018, p. 94.

¹¹ Mickael B. Hoelman, "Meninjau Kerjasama Bantuan Pemangunan bagi Pembiayaan Kesejahteraan" in Ah Maftuchan (et.al.), *Transformasi Kesejahteraan Sosial, Pemenuhan Hak Ekonomi dan Kesehatan Semesta*, Jakarta: LP3ES, 2016, p. 41.

in similar situations in other regions, such as Syria, remain divided by conflict.¹² The way in which ASEAN takes part in voting is different from other international organizations, which can only use weighted voting or simple majority voting. Such ways gradually evolve and their development is not written, but the resulting agreement has been the strong foundation for ASEAN.¹³ The current framework of economic cooperation is subjected to a mechanism of 'Ten Minus X' as proposed by Indonesia and the Philippines. The mechanism was introduced with the aim solely to avoid deadlocks so that such a proposal is regarded as the solution if a consensus was not reached. It confirms that the ASEAN decision making is an unanimity decision-making and it is characterized by intergovernmentalism with the condition to the economic matters subjected to the mechanism of 'Ten Minus X.' To be sure, the decision making at ASEAN is different from that in the European Union (EU), reserving external competencies, especially in terms of implementing the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). In fact, the CFSP covers all fields of foreign policy and all matters relating to the EU security¹⁴ referring to structures of intergovernmentalism and using unanimity mechanism, unless the agreement states otherwise. In essence, the policy under the European Union emphasizes member states are bound to support external policies and security of an active and unconditional union in a spirit of loyalty and solidarity. Though, history shows that scholars questioned the legal binding of obligations carried out in the CFSP. Article 24(3) of the Treaty of the European Union states that member States 'must be in accordance with the actions of the European Union in the region', 'will work together to enhance and develop political solidarity with them', and 'will refrain from actions that conflict with the interests of the European Union or which might damage its effectiveness as a cohesive force in international relations'.¹⁵

According to the manifestation of Indonesia's role as outlined above, it makes sense that ASEAN members consider Indonesia as the *primus inter pares* (the first amongst equals). This is in addition to the fact that Indonesia is one of the ASEAN founding members. ASEAN was formed on August 8, 1967, in Bangkok Thailand through the signing of the Bangkok Declaration by 5 (five) state representatives i.e. Thanat Khoman (Thailand), Narcisco Ramos (the Philippines), Adam Malik

¹² Kishore Mahbubani and Rhoda Severino, "Asean The Way Forward", <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-sector/our-insights/asean-the-way-forward>, accessed on August 2018.

¹³ Huala Adolf, *Hukum Ekonomi Internasional Suatu Pengantar*, Bandung: Keni Media, 2010, p. 104.

¹⁴ "The Member States shall work together to enhance and develop their mutual political solidarity. They shall refrain from any action which is contrary to the interests of the Union or likely to impair its effectiveness as a cohesive force in international relations. The Council and the High Representative shall ensure compliance with these principles." See Article 24(3) of the Treaty of the European Union (TEU).

¹⁵ Henri de Waele and Layered Global Player, *Legal Dynamics on EU External Relations*, Heidelberg: Springer, 2011, p. 27.

(Indonesia), Abdul Razak (Malaysia), and S. Rajaratnam (Singapore).¹⁶ ASEAN has 10 members countries.

The Bangkok Declaration has the following seven objectives. The first objective is to accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the ASEAN region through joint efforts in the spirit of equality and friendship. This objective is carried out to strengthen the foundation of a nation of Southeast Asian nations to be prosperous and peaceful. Second, the Bangkok Declaration aims to intensify regional peace and stability by respecting justice and the rule of law between countries in the region and adhering to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The third is to strengthen active cooperation and help each other on the basis of mutual interest in the economy, social, engineering, science and administration. Fourth, the goal is to provide mutual assistance in the form of training and research facilities in education, profession, engineering, and administration. The fifth objective is to cooperate more effectively to improve agricultural and industrial use, expand trade and assess international commodity problems. This is in spite of the improvement of transportation and communication facilities and the standard of living. Sixth is to advance the study of Southeast Asia. The last objective is to maintain close and useful cooperation with various international and regional organizations having similar objectives to ASEAN and explore all possibilities to work together closely among themselves.

The basis of the objectives is outlined in the preamble of the Bangkok Declaration. Specifically, such basis is clearly written in the preamble's first paragraph of the declaration, stating, "In view of the mutual interests and common problems among Southeast Asian countries and believes in the need to further strengthen ties of solidarity and regional cooperation." It asserts that ASEAN was established to consider the mutual interests and accentuate solidarity in maintaining cooperation. Accordingly, among the very essence of ASEAN countries is subjected to the spirit of solidarity.¹⁷ This is recognized as the superstructure of common interests and problems within the ASEAN member states.

However, the Bangkok Declaration is an international agreement in the form of a declaration whose formality cannot be regarded as international agreement laws similar to treaties, covenants or conventions. In other words, the declaration does not require further national action.¹⁸ Boer Mauna defines the declaration as an agreement containing general provisions and the parties to the declaration promise to implement certain policies in the future. In addition, the contents of

¹⁶ Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapura, Thailand, Filipina, Brunei Darussalam, Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar and Kamboja.

¹⁷ Gautama Budi Arundhati, *op.cit.*

¹⁸ Compare with the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the subsequent covenants: ICCPR and ICESCR 1966.

the declaration are concise and override the formalities of common lawmaking of international agreements.¹⁹

Furthermore, ASEAN wanted a more formal bond through the establishment of a legal framework under the Treaty on Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) signed on February 24, 1976. Subsequently, there was an enlargement to the TAC membership to include countries outside the Southeast Asia region²⁰ with the following principles:

1. mutual respect;
2. domestic sovereignty and freedom without outside interference;
3. non-interference;
4. settlement of differences or disputes in a peaceful means;
5. avoid threats and use force/weapons; and
6. effective cooperation between members.

The principle of solidarity accommodated in the TAC²¹ was explicitly adopted in Paragraph 10 of the Preamble of the ASEAN Charter stating:

"(ASEAN) convinced of the need to strengthen existing bonds of regional solidarity to realize an ASEAN Community that is politically cohesive, economically integrated and socially responsible in order to effectively respond to current and future challenges and opportunities."

In addition, it was reiterated in Article 41 Paragraph 4 of the ASEAN Charter as follows:

"In the conduct of external relations of ASEAN, the Member States on the basis of unity and solidarity will coordinate and endeavor to develop joint positions and pursue joint actions."

Regarding the factual phase of ASEAN solidarity, Kishore Mahbubani and Jeffery Sng divided it into three phases. The first phase was during Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia in December 1978. ASEAN, at that time, consisted of five-member states that opposed the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia. The second phase was in the 1990s which began at the end of the cold war and the onset of the financial crisis in several ASEAN member states. The following several countries

¹⁹ Boer Mauna, *Hukum Internasional, Pengertian, Peranan, dan Fungsi dalam Era Dinamika Global*, Bandung: Penerbit Alumni, 2000, pp. 93-94.

²⁰ Indonesia: 24 February 1976; Malaysia: 24 February 1976; the Philippines: 24 February 1976; Singapore: 24 February 1976; Thailand: 24 February 1976; Brunei 7 January 1984; Papua New Guinea: 5 July 1989; Laos: 29 June 1992; Vietnam 22 July 1992; Cambodia: 23 January 1995; Myanmar: 27 July 1995; People's Republic of China: 8 October 2003; India 8 October 2003; Japan: 2 July 2004; Pakistan: 2 July 2004; South Korea: 27 November 2004; Russia 29 November 2004; New Zealand: 25 July 2005; Mongolia: 28 July 2005; Australia: 10 December 2005; France: 20 July 2006; Timor Leste: 13 January 2007; Bangladesh: 1 August 2007; Sri Lanka: 1 August 2007; North Korea: 24 July 2008; the United States: 23 July 2009; Turkey: 23 July 2010; European Union: 12 June 2012; Brazil: 17 November 2012; Norway: 1 July 2013.

²¹ "The purpose of this Treaty is to promote perpetual peace, everlasting amity and cooperation among their peoples which would contribute to their strength, solidarity and closer relationship". See Article 1 of Treaty on Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia.

joined ASEAN, *inter alia*, Vietnam (1995), Laos (1997), Myanmar (1997), and Cambodia (1999). This addition in membership increased ASEAN solidarity and inclusiveness. The third phase was marked by the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) and the signing of the ASEAN Charter.²²

This principle of solidarity, therefore, brought the establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community aimed at bringing ASEAN people a better level of prosperity. However, it is important to note the different structure of ASEAN to the European Union. Such a difference considers ASEAN's intergovernmentalism structure reflected in the principle of non-intervention, sovereignty, and domestic freedom without any interference from outside parties which subsequently resulted in loose-knit structured organization. This distinct structure is intended to respect the equality of states; each member state has the same position without any higher power. In contrast, the European Union has a denser structure, well-known as supranationalism. It is evidently shown by the European Parliament as a common people's representative institution so that member states in the European Union are subjected to the European Parliament.²³

By paying attention to the principle of solidarity, which heavily considers mutual interests and problems, it also justifies the geographical factor followed by multiculturalism. To this, multiculturalism is what makes ASEAN unique. ASEAN is the only region that has absorbed many different civilizations' cultures such as India, China, Islam, and the West. Therefore, it makes sense that Southeast Asia is a unique region for the human laboratory.²⁴ Almost no other regional organization has successfully developed to improve the living standards of more than six hundred million people and have experienced tremendous progress in the region over the last fifty years as ASEAN.²⁵

In this context, Indonesia adopted a welfare state in order to achieve prosperity for citizens. Such an objective of Indonesia is enshrined in the fourth paragraph of the preamble and Articles 27, 33(1) and 33(4), 34(2), 34(3), and 34(4) of the 1945 Constitution. In legal history, the word '*kesejahteraan*' or 'welfare' appears in two terms. First, '*kesejahteraan umum*' (public welfare) is outlined in the Preamble of the Constitution and second is '*kesejahteraan sosial*' (social welfare) and is embodied in Chapter XIV of the Constitution. The development shows that the term 'social welfare' is often used and raises attention to subject of the welfare state which was first put forward by Sukarno in the session of the Investigatory Committee for the Independence of Indonesia (BPUPKI). The term

²² Kishore Mahbubani and Jeffery Sng, *op.cit.*, pp. 68-69.

²³ Gautama Budi Arundhati, Samuel Saut Martua Samosir and Ratih Listyana Chandra, "Urgensi Legislasi Pelaksanaan mandat UUD 1945 Mengantisipasi ASEAN Economic Community 2015", *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2014, pp. 349-350.

²⁴ Kishore Mahbubani and Jeffery Sng, *op.cit.*, pp. 21-22.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

refers to 'social justice' as the fifth principle of Pancasila (the Five Principles) and Muhammad Hatta justified that the term is similar to Sukarno's term 'social welfare'.²⁶

In order to apply the welfare state, the government signed the ASEAN Charter along with the other governments of ASEAN member states at the 13th ASEAN Summit in Singapore on November 20, 2007. This resulted in the signing of the Declaration on ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint as a guideline for the implementation of the ASEAN Economic Community. Indonesia ratified the ASEAN Charter in Law Number 38 of 2008, dated November 26th, 2008. Juridically, the ratification does not mean Indonesia cannot enjoy the opportunities and take benefits from the ASEAN Economic Community by considering that there is no conflict between the ASEAN Charter and the 1945 Constitution. Rather, both laws have a common goal to prosper citizens; the scope of ASEAN charter is wider at the regional level.

By scrutinizing the correlation between Indonesia's important role in ASEAN, it should be noted that, in the end, national security is largest concern. Indeed, national security plays an important role in the life of the nation in order to maintain its existence and efforts to achieve national goals. There are various concentrations within of national security, such as ideological security, political security, economic security, socio-cultural security, and defense security. The application of such various securities, however, heavily depends on food security.²⁷

1. Food Security in Indonesia

Historically, the term 'food security' was not popular until the 1970s. It was initially introduced in the World Food Conference in 1974²⁸ whose definition relied upon the situation strongly influenced by Cold War. In this era, there was an instability of food trade; therefore, almost all countries were driven to adopt food self-sufficiency.²⁹ Thus, food security was generally defined as the ability of states to provide and produce food for themselves. Food self-sufficiency was the single indicator of food security.³⁰ Amidst the development of the rapid economy, however, there has been a shifting definition of food security from the aspects of supply and availability to its entitlement.³¹ This new scope asserts that food is principally under human entitlements with risks. In the words of Amartya Sen, its

²⁶ Ah Maftuchan (et.al), *op.cit.*, p. XXXI-XXXII.

²⁷ Soetomo, *Kesejahteraan dan Upaya Mewujudkannya dalam perspektif Masyarakat Lokal*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2014, p. 184.

²⁸ Jonatan Lassa, "Politik Ketahanan Pangan Indonesia 1950-2005", ZEF Centre for Development Research, 2005, https://www.zef.de/uploads/tx_zefportal/Publications/3ddf_Politik%20Ketahanan%20Pangan%20Indonesia%201950-2005.pdf, accessed on August 2018.

²⁹ Pantjar Simatupang, "Analisis Kritis terhadap Paradigma dan Kerangka Dasar Kebijakan Ketahanan Pangan Nasional", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 2007, p. 6.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Jonatan Lassa, *op.cit.*, p. 2.

risks are the challenge of food security which is primarily triggered by the shortage of food access resulted in global famine.³² Therefore, this definition affirms that the absence of food security may happen in a country which has undergone a big harvest as long as the food access cannot be well provided.

In the Indonesian context, food has been placed as an essential aspect long before Indonesia gained independence. During the Dutch's colonialism, the price of food was fully controlled by the colonial ruler with aims to provide a cheaper food price so that all families could access and consume it.³³ After Indonesia gained independence, Sukarno's food policy primarily was copied from the colonial ruler to gain political support from grassroots and protect his powers from government officials and military by providing rice as part of the monthly salary.³⁴ Nevertheless, Sukarno's era clearly placed food security as the national strategic component. He highlighted the importance of food security at the Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Indonesia in Bogor in 1952 as follows:

*"... What I will say is that very important, that it is on the life and death of our nation in the future.... Therefore, on what I will talk here is on the supply and availability of people's food."*³⁵

In 1952-1956, Sukarno applied rice self-sufficiency through a Kasimo welfare program.³⁶ It was introduced by the Minister of Agriculture, Kasimo, with the ultimate aim to achieve national food self-sufficiency.³⁷ In 1956-1964, Sukarno upgraded the self-sufficiency program into the Rice Center under *Yayasan Badan Pembelian Padi*.³⁸ In 1963, Sukarno added corn as part of the staple food due to the rice shortage in the market.³⁹ In 1964, Sukarno introduced *Panca Usaha Tani*, or the Five Efforts of Farmers, integrated into Rice Center by providing quality seeds and improving tillage management.⁴⁰ In addition, the program included the preference of complete, appropriate, and good fertilizers, pest and plant disease controls, and irrigation.⁴¹

Regardless, agriculture in Suharto era, the second phase of Indonesia's government, was among the priorities of a strategic program called *Repelita* (*Repelita I-VI*). *Repelita I* (1969-1974) was primarily focused on the adequacy of

³² Amartya Sen, *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981, p. 1.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Achmad Suryana, *op.cit.*

³⁶ Budi Winarno, *Komparasi Organisasi Pedesaan dalam Pembangunan: Indonesia vis-à-vis Taiwan, Thailand dan Filipina*, Yogyakarta: Media Pressindo, 2003, p. 80.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Juli Panglima Saragih, "Kelembagaan Urusan Pangan dari Masa ke Masa dan Kebijakan Ketahanan Pangan", *Jurnal Pangan*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 2017, p. 63.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

food, clothing and agricultural infrastructure. *Repelita II* (1974-1978) was aimed at the agricultural sector to fulfill domestic food so that it laid the foundation of the agricultural industry. *Repelita III* (1979-1984) remained to focus on agriculture. The success in agricultural development was supported by the agricultural green revolution program resulted in food self-sufficiency for rice commodity.

Repelita IV (1984-1989) created food self-sufficiency stabilization by enhancing agricultural industry in order to introduce agricultural engines. In this period, it was considered a program that encouraged income distribution and expansion of employment to gain national welfare. *Repelita V* (1989-1994) considered the agricultural industry to support food self-sufficiency and produce agricultural commodities for export. *Repelita VI* (1994-1999) focused on the development of industrial sectors to boost economic development.

Nevertheless, the framework of regulation and institution in food policy can be traced from the beginning of Suharto's food policy. As a result of the turbulent political transition from Sukarno to Suharto and by considering the strategic plans under Repelita, one of Suharto's salient features in food policy was the establishment of the Food Logistics Agency or *Badan Urusan Logistik* (Bulog). This institution was intended as a specialized agency of food policy in order to stabilize food prices⁴² so that supply and control of national food economy was subsequently under Bulog.⁴³ It is important to note that eventually Bulog was behind Suharto's success in agricultural reform. Through the government's purchase price or *Harga Pembelian Pemerintah* (HPP), Bulog significantly contributed to the government's goals of achieving national self-sufficiency by providing a minimum price for farmers to anticipate market-oriented policies which potentially harmed them.⁴⁴

As a specialized food institution, Bulog had a strategic role to protect farmers during the rice production, thus, this might be the underlying reason that prices of national's prioritized staple food and other domestic foods are controlled by the government. Indeed, such success was inextricable to Suharto administration's claims on proper food policy by building a synergy of Village Cooperatives or *Koperasi Unit Desa* (KUD).⁴⁵ KUD was granted the primary duty to collect and distribute rice from small farmers, particularly during the harvest period.⁴⁶ As the reserved food was in crisis, Bulog would take a measure by importing rice to overcome food shortages. These measures were taken during planting period.⁴⁷

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Muhammad Bahrul Ulum, *op.cit.*, p. 321.

⁴⁴ Sachin Kumar Sharma, "Indonesia: Product Specific Support to Rice Under WTO" in Sachin Kumar Sharma, *WTO Food Security*, Singapore: Springer, 2016, p. 84.

⁴⁵ Shahidur Rashid, Ashok Gulati, and Ralph Waldo Cummings Jr, *From Parastatals to Private Trade: Lessons from Asian Agriculture*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press for International Food Policy Research Institute, 2008, p. 140.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

The collaboration between KUD and Bulog was claimed to have positive impacts on food distribution so that the efficiency achieved resulted in affordable food prices. However, in the end, Bulog was seen as a corruptive institution so that food policy's central planning system was shifted to a market economy in the late 20th century.⁴⁸ Indeed, while Bulog was appreciated because it allowed Indonesia to gain self-sufficiency in the 1980s. The evidence shows that Bulog, from 1969 to 1982, was challenged by untenable problems that lead to food scarcity.⁴⁹ Therefore, it concludes that, since its beginning, Bulog was essentially not a powerful institution when it dealt with national problems. This is mainly because the national staple food primarily relies upon a single commodity.

It is essential to note that, since the early 1990s, Indonesia had dreadful episodes, particularly after the Cold War ended with the triumph of capitalism.⁵⁰ Though Suharto replaced Sukarno's regime with the auspices of global capitalism, he failed to transform the national economy to a liberal market with an efficient system.⁵¹ Therefore, as the wave of widespread liberalization has been accepted globally, the important cause on the question of why Indonesia's food policy has been shifted to liberalization is that Bulog was inefficient and the rampant corruption led to Bulog's mismanagement. Inefficiency was not primarily caused by the free market, but Indonesia retained the policy into a monopoly so that all the costs were borne by the government budget.⁵² The rampant corruption, indicated by the oligarchic relations of Suharto's political-business elites and private actors such as Salim Group, resulted in non-transparency.⁵³ The financial audit reported by Arthur Andersen concluded that inefficiency accumulated up to USD 400 billion every year from 1993 to 1998.⁵⁴

Against barriers to provide food self-sufficiency in the early 1990s,⁵⁵ liberalization embraced the Indonesian economy as a result of the establishment of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Since its establishment, the WTO comes with a new economic order specialized in world trade.⁵⁶ Indonesia joined the WTO by ratifying the agreement into Law No. 7 of 1994. As a result, the government of Indonesia is obliged to bring about legal conformity and harmonize legislative and

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

⁴⁹ Juli Panglima Saragih, *op.cit.*, p. 63.

⁵⁰ Richard Robison and Vedi R Hadiz, *Reorganising Power in Indonesia: The Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets*, London: Taylor & Francis, 2004, p. 40.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Shahidur Rashid, Ashok Gulati, and Ralph Waldo Cummings Jr, *op.cit.*, p. 141.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

⁵⁵ It is mentioned that from 1989 to 1991, Indonesia was *net exporter*. See Budi Winarno, *Kebijakan Publik Era Globalisasi: Teori, Proses dan Studi Kasus Komparatif*, Yogyakarta: Center for Academic Publishing Service, 2016, p. 236.

⁵⁶ Matthias Herdegen, *Principles of International Economic Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, p. 178.

administrative tasks in the national legal system on trade according to the WTO Agreement.

Such ratification brings influential impacts on Indonesia's international trade policy by taking into account domestic trade policies that should be subjected to WTO Laws.⁵⁷ These impacts are exemplified from the WTO Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) that the guidance of the government of Indonesia is to comply with agricultural liberalization.⁵⁸ As a result, Indonesia was obliged to harmonize its municipal laws to world trade regulations to proliferate the liberalization of agricultural sectors. In other words, the national economic policy has been driven into a market mechanism which demands to remove trade barriers⁵⁹ so that it stimulates international market competition.⁶⁰

This situation brings the strategic role of Bulog into skepticism, especially after Indonesia's financial collapse in 1998. This financial collapse resulted in the government seeking financial assistance from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for national economic recovery. Prior to giving financial aid, the IMF required Indonesia to liberalize the national food policy which resulted in the paralysis of Bulog into the Memorandum of Economic and Financial Policies signed by the IMF and the Government of Indonesia with the following terms and conditions. First, the import monopoly of wheat and union should be removed so that private importers can marketize all products in the domestic market, except wheat.⁶¹ It applied tariffs but limited to a maximum of 20% or less and it will gradually be reduced up to 5% in 2003.⁶² Second, the reduction of tariffs to all food products up to 5% and the provisions on local contents for milk should be removed.⁶³ Third, the Bulog monopoly is only limited to rice in which it is strictly limited for domestic supply.⁶⁴ Fourth, all importers can import sugar and marketize it into the domestic market.⁶⁵

As a result, Bulog no longer has the powers to control food prices. Bulog had entered into a transitional, restructuring phase to meet transparency and accountability standards.⁶⁶ This phase is aimed to transform Bulog to be an

⁵⁷ Gregory Messenger, *The Development of World Trade Organization Law: Examining Change in International Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, p. 75.

⁵⁸ Dewa Swastika and Sri Nuryanti, "The Implementation of Trade Liberalization in Indonesia" *Analisis Kebijakan Pertanian*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 2006, p. 257.

⁵⁹ Peter Rosset, *Food Is Different: Why We Must Get the WTO out of Agriculture: Global issues series*, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publisher, 2006, p. 4.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁶¹ Shahidur Rashid, Ashok Gulati, and Ralph Waldo Cummings Jr, *op.cit.*, p. 148.

⁶² Daljit Singh and Chin Kin Wah, *Southeast Asian Affairs 2004*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2004, p. 197; Budi Winarno, *Kebijakan Publik Era Globalisasi: Teori, Proses dan Studi Kasus Komparatif*, *op.cit.*, p. 231.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Shahidur Rashid, Ashok Gulati, and Ralph Waldo Cummings Jr, *op.cit.*, p. 138.

efficient agency to manage the supply and distribution of staple foods, though other powers which were granted to Bulog were reduced.⁶⁷ Since 2003 this agency has been transformed into a state-owned enterprise which would be among market players along with private actors in a deregulated food policy.⁶⁸ As a state-owned enterprise, Bulog is limited to food supply and does business without any powers to stabilize food prices. Therefore, Bulog will conduct market operations by providing rice for the poor, or *beras miskin* (raskin),⁶⁹ in response to the increase in rice prices.⁷⁰

While Bulog has been limited in its market operations, it confirms that Indonesia does not have any strategic institutional design to drive food sovereignty policy. In fact, as Timmer in his study concluded by referencing Indonesia, Japan, and the United Kingdom, economic growth will be sustainable if the country is previously able to solve domestic food problems.⁷¹ The study asserts that food is not only for domestic consumption but also the development of the national economy. Hence, there is a prompting need for a comprehensive design to lay food policy at the forefront to drive the robust economy.

Against this fact, as a result of food liberalization that gradually transforms into deregulation and severely affects unsystematic food program under decentralization, Indonesia tried to create a new framework. Currently, Indonesia's food policy is based upon Law No 18 of 2012 on Food (the Food Act). This law brings new, salient features underpinned by the resurgence of a specialized agency to promote ultimate aims to embodying food sovereignty, food self-sufficiency, and national food security.

The adoption of these three concepts, however, seems to be contradicted as it does not provide a comprehensive design to the extent to which each of them will be achieved. Article 36 allows the government to import food as long as there is no adequate domestic food supply. According to this act, the government is required to provide the data to which it ends up prompting the need to import. Yet, this article notes the indication of corruptive practices. Such practices are referenced to Indonesia's lost appeal on the dispute against New Zealand and the United States over trade restrictions on food, animal products, and horticulture. There

⁶⁷ Presidential Decree Number 19 of 1998 on the amendment of the Presidential Decree Number 50 of 1995 on Food Logistics Agency as it was subsequently amended to Presidential Decree Number 15 of 1997.

⁶⁸ Ian Gillson and Amir Fouad (eds.), *Trade Policy and Food Security: Improving Access to Food in Developing Countries in the Wake of High World Prices*, Washington DC: The World Bank, 2014, p. 19.

⁶⁹ Perum BULOG, "Sekilas RASKIN", http://www.bulog.co.id/sekilas_raskin.php, accessed on November 2018.

⁷⁰ Tribun News, "Bulog DIY Gelar Operasi Pasar untuk Stabilkan Harga Beras", <http://jogja.tribunnews.com/2015/01/06/bulog-diy-gelar-operasi-pasar-untuk-stabilkan-harga-beras>, accessed on November 2018.

⁷¹ Handewi Purwati Saliem, Adreng Purwoto, and Gatoet Sroe Hardono, "Kebijakan Pengelolaan Cadangan Pangan pada Era Otonomi Daerah dan Perum Bulog", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2005, p. 76.

were corruptive practices as import procedures are based on the recommendation of the Ministry of Agriculture depending on unreliable production and consumption data.⁷² While this provision does not provide clear criteria in which the government imports food and provides an alternative, it asserts that Indonesia's food dependence on importing will remain high.

Nevertheless, the resurgence of the specialized food agencies becomes a new hope for the landscape of Indonesia's food policy. Article 126 is the underpinning provision on the establishment of the institution whose administration is similar to Bulog's initial institutional design and power; both are the direct responsibility of the President. In contrast to Bulog, the new agency is entitled vast powers, proposing state-owned enterprises in food to the President for production, supply, storage, and distribution, whether staple foods or any other foods. However, such a new agency is not established yet because the further provision requires the institution to be laid down in a subsequent administrative regulation. Yet, while proposing a new agency, it is important to consider the fall of Bulog. The fall began in the early 1990s as the design did not include adequate governance in its practices.⁷³

Despite the institutional design, the Food Act does not provide a framework to accommodate food diversification. As a result of Indonesia's dependence on rice, especially beginning from Suharto's period, food diversification is important to consider for realizing food sovereignty, food self-sufficiency, and food security. The data reveals that Indonesia has the largest production of rice in ASEAN, but it is followed by a high number in consumption of rice.⁷⁴ This absence of food diversification affirms that the government needs to provide policies aimed at addressing this problem.

In addition, by highlighting the success of Indonesia's food reserve in the 1980s, it is important to reconsider the involvement of *Koperasi Unit Desa* (KUD). Historically, the establishment of KUD's was aimed to be the center of production and distribution of food for each community. These cooperative would distribute food at a decent price and, subsequently, they be part of the price control in staple foods.⁷⁵ In fact, KUD's were left behind in the 2000s as a result of the shifting food policy and the restructuring of Bulog as a state-owned enterprise.

In this context, the revitalization of KUD's is aimed to provide an alternative, as it was successful in promoting food self-sufficiency in the 1980s by linking farmers

⁷² The Jakarta Post, "When Indonesia loses WTO appeal", <http://www.thejakartapost.com/academia/2018/08/09/when-indonesia-loses-wto-appeal.html>, accessed on November 2018.

⁷³ Budi Winarno, *Kebijakan Publik Era Globalisasi: Teori, Proses dan Studi Kasus Komparatif*, op.cit., p. 326.

⁷⁴ Hermanto, "Ketahanan Pangan Indonesia di Kawasan ASEAN", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2015, p. 21.

⁷⁵ Sumaryanto, "Peranan KUD dalam pengadaan Gabah/Beras dalam Negeri", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 4., No. 2, 1986, p. 1.

in villages and the government. It is essential to note that KUD's are institutions subjected to collective participation, so all members can be both producers and sellers. As a result, these cooperatives can bring about the food self-management on a lower scale and driven for the welfare of all members.⁷⁶ In other words, when KUD's work, they will bring positive impacts when penetrating the price volatility so that farmers can be a part of price makers rather than price takers. In the end, the revitalization of KUD's is not only to empower farmers in villages for selling their products but also to promote national food supply for food security so that the dependence on imported food can be reduced.

C. Food Security in the Integration Process of ASEAN Community

In dealing with food, there has been an agreement at the ASEAN level starting with the Agreement on ASEAN Food Security Reserve (ASFR). Such an agreement is regarded as the principal agreement signed by the first five-member states: Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Singapore. This agreement was signed in 1979 and reflected the importance of food reserves at the regional level. In the ASFR, the ASEAN Food Security Reserve is defined as the total amount of staple food stocks, primarily rice, maintained by each member state of ASEAN under national jurisdiction as national policy, including the commitment against the ASEAN emergency rice reserve.⁷⁷ Indeed, at the time, rice was prioritized to be the parameter of food security in the ASEAN context.

The ASFR procedurally demands the ASEAN member states the release of the ASEAN emergency rice reserve for emergency requirements to anticipate food scarcity of any ASEAN member state. Such procedures include the requirements of the ASEAN member state in need to notify the other ASEAN member states or countries of the emergency by providing the necessary amount of rice. The other ASEAN member states are required to take immediate measures to ensure the release of rice needed by other member states, so needs can be quickly fulfilled. In addition, prices, terms, and conditions of payment in kind or otherwise in respect of the released rice shall be the subject of direct negotiation between concerned parties of the ASEAN member states. In the end, the ASEAN member states are required to inform the ASEAN Food Security Reserve Board (ASFRB) of its request to the other ASEAN member states.⁷⁸

In addition, the establishment of the ASEAN Food Security Reserve Board in the ASFR Agreement asserts a specific concern. The Board was aimed to oversee and coordinate the implementation of ASEAN Food Reserve Security in which each

⁷⁶ Bambang Suprayitno, "Kritik terhadap Koperasi (serta Solusinya) sebagai Media Pendorong Pertumbuhan Usaha Mikro, Kecil, dan Menengah (UMKM)", *Jurnal Ekonomi Pendidikan*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2007, p. 19.

⁷⁷ See Article 2(2) of Agreement on ASEAN Food Security Reserve, 1979 (ASFR).

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, art. 5.

ASEAN member states are represented by one person on the Board. Subsequently, with the development of ASEAN, the ASEAN Community 2009-2015 Roadmap was established. The ASEAN Community is driven to be the ASEAN single market and production base consisting of five core elements: free flow of goods, service, investment, capital, and skilled labor. Therefore, a single market and production base includes the integration of prioritized sectors, food, agriculture, and forestry.⁷⁹

Subsequently, the food fields, agriculture, and forestry are aimed at increasing intra-and extra-ASEAN trade and long-term competitiveness of ASEAN food, agriculture, and forestry commodities through several actions. First, there is the monitoring of the implementation of the CEPT-AFTA scheme for agricultural and forestry products. Second is the development and application of a fisheries quality management system that guarantees food security and supports the competitive position of ASEAN fishery products on the world market. This action is created through the implementation, validation, verification of system-based security and adaptation of quality and safety management systems. Through this action, such systems can be applied to small businesses in ASEAN and are expected to create best practices for agriculture and aquaculture, animal husbandry, hygiene for agricultural and food products with significant trading potential. The third action is the harmonization and standardization on international standards in quarantine and sanitary and phytosanitary procedures for agricultural, food and forestry products. Fourth is the maximum limit of pesticide residues for plant products, safety standards and quality of horticulture products and agricultural products. It includes the control of animal health for food safety, harmonization of guidelines for the use of chemicals in cultivation without the use of hazardous chemicals,⁸⁰ all of which lead to trade problems. Furthermore, other provisions in the economic pillar are to be used to promote cooperation, joint approaches, and technology transfer among ASEAN member states, international regional organizations and private sectors.⁸¹ In addition, they include promoting ASEAN agricultural cooperation as a means to empower and increase market access for agricultural products and build a network mechanism for the benefit of farmers in the region.⁸²

Further plans regarding the issue of food security are included in the ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2025. The first plan is to identify infrastructure investment needs to increase production and reduce post-production losses to meet projected future demand and ensure food security, review existing investment programs and answer investment needs in the food and agriculture

⁷⁹ See section A.9 of ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2009-2015 (AEC Blueprint 2015).

⁸⁰ See section A.7, 38 of AEC Blueprint 2015.

⁸¹ See section A.7. 39, of AEC Blueprint 2015.

⁸² See section A.7. 40 of AEC Blueprint 2015.

sector.⁸³ The second goal is to develop new and appropriate technologies, best practices, and management systems to ensure food security and address health/disease and environmental problems, especially in the rapidly growing aquaculture, livestock and horticulture sectors;⁸⁴

ASEAN cooperation in food, agriculture, and forestry (FAF) plays an important role in the context of increasing population. It is followed by the demand for strong revenue growth and a growing middle class, so that the FAF sector is competitive, inclusive, resilient, and sustainable agenda integrated to the global economy. While ASEAN is based upon a single market and production base, the organization contributes to food and nutrition security, and prosperity in the ASEAN Community. This is with the aim of ensuring better food security and nutrition, gaining access to global markets and increasing resilience to climate change.

Accordingly, there are a number of considerations regarding the mechanisms a more integrated agenda of the FAF sector. Such considerations, however, are carried out through some efforts as follows:

1. trade facilitation and economic integration;
2. cooperation and capacity for sustainable production;
3. agricultural productivity;
4. investment in agricultural science and technology; and
5. involvement of agricultural producers in the process of globalization.⁸⁵

On the other hand, there is a concept of increasing food security with the aim to ensure adequate access to food at all times for all of the ASEAN society and food security in ASEAN member states. It is divided into three levels.⁸⁶ The first level is at the state level members. This level starts with the harmonization of national food security regulations according to internationally accepted standards with the following strengthening the ability to carry out risk analysis in the food sector. The second is at the ASEAN level. This relates to the area of regional institutions and concerns the strengthening of the ASEAN Coordinating Committee on Food Security. The objective is to coordinate the implementation of all ASEAN institutions' work programs while increasing the role of the ASEAN Food Security Reserve Board. The goal is also to increase regional staple food supplies. In addition, in the regulatory context, the level is to develop a legislative framework, guideline model, and to strengthen food inspection and certification systems in ASEAN member countries. This is followed by the promotion of competency in food laboratory networks through facilitating the exchange of information,

⁸³ See ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2016-2025 (AEC Blueprint 2025).

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ See section C.5 55-57 of AEC Blueprint 2025.

⁸⁶ See section B. 3. 21 of ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2009-2015 (ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2015).

findings, experiences, and best practices. The last level is the shared competence. At this level, there is the promotion of the safe and healthy food production by producers at all levels. There is also the goal to increase consumer participation and empowerment in food security. In addition, this level aims to enhance ASEAN intra and extra food trade cooperation to ensure stability in regional food distribution to ensure food availability for all ASEAN citizens and others with the goal of improving health.

The focus of ASEAN on food is continuing, as it can be seen from the ASCC Blueprint 2025. In the preamble of the Blueprint, it states that the majority of the population in a number of ASEAN member states are vulnerable to poverty if there is a significant increase in food prices. This is indicated from a surge in global food prices in 2007-2008.⁸⁷ The Blueprint elucidates the required strategic steps on the basis of equal access in order to ensure the effectiveness to the implementation of strategies and programs under the ASCC. Besides, the Blueprint is also aimed at promoting harmonization with the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC) and the AEC, especially in the field of social protection, universal health coverage, food security, poverty alleviation, employment and decent work, and trafficking in persons.⁸⁸ This affirms that such a focus is a significant improvement relevant to the correlation between the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC) and the food problem. Indeed, it is undeniable that the ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint 2009-2015 does not cover the issue of food security and this awareness confirms partial implementation as the evidence shows the absence of food security problems in the ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint 2025.

D. The Concept of Integration on Food Security at the ASEAN Level

By taking into account food as an important entity for a nation and when looking more comprehensively at food management at the ASEAN level, food is not included in the ASEAN Charter. The charter indicates that food was not regarded as a serious problem facing the region. The document evidently shows that food security at the ASEAN level falls into the two pillars of ASEAN, not in the three existing pillars. It affirms that the concept of food security is not included in the concept of regional security and resilience.

In 2009, ASEAN released the ASEAN Integrated Food Security (AIFS) Framework and Strategic Plan of Action on Food Security in the ASEAN region (SPA-FS) 2009-2013 (hereinafter referred to as AIFS SPA-FS 2009-2013).⁸⁹ SPA-FS AIFS 2009-2013

⁸⁷ See intro paragraph 3 of ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2016-2025 (ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2025).

⁸⁸ See section D.5 of ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2025.

⁸⁹ ASEAN Integrated Food Security (AIFS) Framework and Strategic Plan for Action on Food Security in The ASEAN Region 2009-2013 resulted from meeting officials senior special of the 29th meeting of the ASEAN Ministers for Agriculture and Forestry (Special SOM-29th AMAF), held on 5-7 August 2008 in Chiang Mai. This meeting discussed the concept of notes on the ASEAN Integrated Resilience Framework (AIFS) and

was motivated by a sharp increase in international food prices in 2007 and 2008 which had a serious impact on the socio-economic status of ASEAN member countries. The increase in food prices was due to several factors, such as the increase of agricultural production costs due to the increase of gasoline and fertilizer prices, the decrease in yield and production due to climate change, and storage costs. On the demand side, there was a change in the structure of demand for food commodities in the global market, competition for some agricultural commodities and land use for biofuels coupled with agricultural market speculation. Thus, the development of a policy framework in the form of strategic steps to ensure long-term food security in the ASEAN region is needed.⁹⁰ SPA-FS AIFS 2009-2013 realizes the need to handle food security in the form of:

1. mutual understanding among member countries;
2. timely and reliable data and information for policy decisions;
3. a long-term agricultural development plan that focuses on sustainable food production and trade.

In addition, ASEAN conducts regional cooperation with the aim of strengthening food security, alleviating poverty, and eradicating malnutrition in the region. Yet, the association does not distort normal trade in the global market through the ASEAN Plus Three Rice Reserve (APTERR).⁹¹ This Reserve consists of ASEAN Plus People's Republic of China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea and aims to ensure joint food security. The emergency rice reserve considers rice that is voluntarily donated to APTERR in the form of physical cash and/or rice stocks collectively owned by APTERR member countries and managed by the APTERR Secretariat under the supervision of the APTERR Board. The reserve is intended to anticipate emergencies; for instance, when APTERR member countries would face extreme and unexpected disasters so that it resulted in insufficient national reserves.⁹² Therefore, the role of such a reserve shows the immense commitment of ASEAN member states together with the People's Republic of China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea to anticipate a food crisis in the future.

Indeed, the concept of food security at the ASEAN level appears to be well established though it still results in some problems. Such problems will be at the ASEAN regional level by putting the ASEAN food security under the ASEAN Economic Community. This confirms that food is part of commodities containing

concretized and further elaborating on the AIFS Framework, Special AMAF-29 AMAF formed an ad-hoc task force to develop detailed work plans, including Strategic Action Plans on Food Security for the ASEAN Region (SPA-FS).

⁹⁰ See ASEAN Integrated Food Security Framework and Strategic Plan of the ASEAN Region's Action on Food Security 2009-2013.

⁹¹ The establishment of APTERR based on an agreement signed by the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry from 13 ASEAN Plus Three-member countries on October 7, 2011 in Jakarta and entered into force on July 12, 2012.

⁹² ASEAN Plus Three Emergency Rice Reserve, "FAQ", <https://www.apterr.org/faq>, accessed on November 2018.

economic purposes with the following its inclusion to the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) asserting food historically reflects the common tradition and culture. However, it does not consider food security as part of the pillars of the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC).

In fact, in the context of the history of food security of ASEAN, especially Indonesia, member countries have experienced several types of crises. First, there is the crisis in which the government escaped to handle rice. This resulted in the 1965-66 rice crisis and lasted with the G30S/PKI, and the 1997-98 crisis along with the financial crisis. Second, there is the crisis in which the government already has serious anticipation, such as the crisis in 1997-98 and 2007-08. Third, there is the crisis that is characterized by the government that was not ready to face a crisis due to misinformation in 1972. The fourth, there is the crisis characterized by the government being ready to face the rice crisis by gradually strengthening agricultural infrastructure as it is today.⁹³ It is essential to note, regarding the alternative solution against the unsynchronized problem to data and information on the availability of rice, it was finally clarified and corrected. Indeed, it should be considered that there exists a fairly wide deviation between the old methods using tiered manual methods and new methods using Area Sample Framework. While the old data comes from the Ministry of Agriculture compiled from the agricultural service throughout Indonesia, the new data comes from satellite imagery from the National Aeronautics and Space Institute (LAPAN) and processed in stages by involving the Geospatial Information Agency (BIG), Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning (ATR), Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT) and the Central Statistics Agency (BPS).⁹⁴ The immense commitment of the Indonesian government in dealing with food security, especially regarding rice, is demonstrated by improving agricultural infrastructure and, at the same time, intensifying rice methods and data. These are important achievements in the context of food security at the ASEAN level. Indeed, it considers the significant position of Indonesia in ASEAN.

E. Conclusion

Collective food security in ASEAN remains an appealing discussion by understanding the fact that food is the basic need of humankind. By considering the experiences of Indonesia and the fact that the other member states, such as the Philippines and Malaysia, have a similar problem at providing domestic food, the integration of the ASEAN Community needs to reflect at the inclusion of food security as regional concerns. Therefore, the principle of solidarity plays an important role to embed food security into the framework in order to reimagine

⁹³ Sapuan Gafar, "Memahami Krisis Beras", *Opini Kompas Cetak*, 18 October 2018, p. 6.

⁹⁴ Dwi Ardian, "Era Baru Data Beras", *Opini Kompas Cetak*, 19 October 2018.

food. Solidarity is essentially the common problem and driving collective food security to the regional level. Indeed, ASEAN initiated the agreement on the ASEAN Food Security Reserve, and this shows that ASEAN essentially realized the regional problem of food security. With the following globalized world, the integration of regional community is paramount, and the ASEAN community is undeniable. However, the pillars of integration comprising of economic, social and cultural, and political-security communities are inadequate without considering food security in which food, on the other hand, has influential impacts on political-security concerns.

References

Books

- Ah Maftuchan (et.al.), *Transformasi Kesejahteraan Sosial, Pemenuhan Hak Ekonomi dan Kesehatan Semesta*, LP3ES, Jakarta, 2016.
- Al Khanif, Mirza Satria Buana, and Manunggal Kusuma Wardaya (eds.), *Pancasila Dalam Pusaran Globalisasi*, LKIS, Yogyakarta, 2017.
- Boer Mauna, *Hukum Internasional, Pengertian, Peranan, dan Fungsi dalam Era Dinamika Global*, Penerbit Alumni, Bandung, 2000.
- Budi Winarno, *Kebijakan Publik Era Globalisasi: Teori, Proses dan Studi Kasus Komparatif*, Center for Academic Publishing Service, Yogyakarta, 2016.
- , *Komparasi Organisasi Pedesaan dalam Pembangunan: Indonesia vis-à-vis Taiwan, Thailand dan Filipina*, Media Pressindo, Yogyakarta, 2003.
- de Waele, Henri and Layered Global Player, *Legal Dynamics on EU External Relations*, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- Faudzan Farhana and Hayati Nufus, *Kita dan ASEAN: Ayo Berlari Bersama*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta, 2016.
- Herdegen, Matthias, *Principles of International Economic Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013.
- Huala Adolf, *Hukum Ekonomi Internasional Suatu Pengantar*, Keni Media, Bandung, 2010.
- Ian Gillson and Amir Fouad (eds.), *Trade Policy and Food Security: Improving Access to Food in Developing Countries in the Wake of High World Prices*, The World Bank, Washington DC, 2014.
- Kishore Mahbubani and Jeffery Sng, *Keajaiban ASEAN: Penggerak Perdamaian*, Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta, 2017.
- Messenger, Gregory, *The Development of World Trade Organization Law: Examining Change in International Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2016.

- Rashid, Shahidur, Ashok Gulati, and Ralph Waldo Cummings Jr, *From Parastatals to Private Trade: Lessons from Asian Agriculture*, The John Hopkins University Press for International Food Policy Research Institute, Baltimore, 2008.
- Robison, Richard and Vedi R Hadiz, *Reorganising Power in Indonesia: The Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets*, Taylor & Francis, London, 2004.
- Roby Arya Brata, *Membangun Integritas, Akuntabilitas, dan Efektivitas Pemerintahan*, Pustaka Kemang, Depok, 2018.
- Rosset, Peter, *Food Is Different: Why We Must Get the WTO out of Agriculture: Global issues series*, Fernwood Publisher, Nova Scotia, 2006.
- Sen, Amartya, *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Sharma, Sachin Kumar, *WTO Food Security*, Springer, Singapore, 2016.
- Singh, Daljit and Chin Kin Wah, *Southeast Asian Affairs 2004*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, 2004.
- Soetomo, *Kesejahteraan dan Upaya Mewujudkannya dalam perspektif Masyarakat Lokal*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta, 2014.
- Tim Redaksi Kompas, *Tinjauan Kompas Menatap Indonesia 2015 Antara Tantangan dan Harapan*, Penerbit Buku Kompas, Jakarta, 2015.

Other Documents

- Achmad Suryana, "Menelisik Ketahanan Pangan, Kebijakan Pangan, dan Swasembada Beras" *Pengembangan Inovasi Pertanian*, Vol. 1 No. 1, 2008.
- ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2009-2015.
- ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2016-2025.
- ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2009-2015.
- ASEAN Community Roadmap for ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2016-2025.
- ASEAN Integrated Food Security (AIFS) Framework.
- ASEAN Plus Three Emergency Rice Reserve, "FAQ", <https://www.apterr.org/faq>, accessed on November 2018.
- Australian Trade and Investment Commission (Austrade), "Introduction", <https://www.austrade.gov.au/asean-now/introduction/>, accessed on August 2018.
- Bambang Suprayitno, "Kritik terhadap Koperasi (serta Solusinya) sebagai Media Pendorong Pertumbuhan Usaha Mikro, Kecil, dan Menengah (UMKM)", *Jurnal Ekonomi Pendidikan*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2007.

- Dawe, David Charles, Piedad Moya, and Cheryll B Casiwan, "Why Does the Philippines Import Rice? Meeting the Challenge of Trade Liberalization", *International Rice Research Institute*, 2006.
- Dewa Swastika and Sri Nuryanti, "The Implementation of Trade Liberalization in Indonesia" *Analisis Kebijakan Pertanian*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 2006.
- Dwi Ardian, "Era Baru Data Beras", *Opini Kompas Cetak*, 19 October 2018.
- Gautama Budi Arundhati, "Dinamika Relasi Antara Prinsip Non-Interference dan Prinsip Solidaritas ASEAN", *Era Hukum Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum*, Vo. 1, No. 1, 2017.
- Gautama Budi Arundhati, Samuel Saut Martua Samosir and Ratih Listyana Chandra, "Urgensi Legislasi Pelaksanaan mandat UUD 1945 Mengantisipasi ASEAN Economic Community 2015", *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2014.
- Handewi Purwati Saliem, Adreng Purwoto, and Gatoet Sroe Hardono, "Kebijakan Pengelolaan Cadangan Pangan pada Era Otonomi Daerah dan Perum Bulog", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2005.
- Hermanto, "Ketahanan Pangan Indonesia di Kawasan ASEAN", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2015.
- Iwan Hermawan, "Analisis Perdagangan Beras dan Ketahanan Pangan di Negara-Negara Asia Tenggara" *Jurnal Politica*, Vol. 4 No. 2, 2013.
- Jonatan Lassa, "Politik Ketahanan Pangan Indonesia 1950-2005", *ZEF Centre for Development Research*, 2005, https://www.zef.de/uploads/tx_zefportal/Publications/3ddf_Politik%20Ketahanan%20Pangan%20Indonesia%201950-2005.pdf, accessed on August 2018.
- Juli Panglima Saragih, "Kelembagaan Urusan Pangan dari Masa ke Masa dan Kebijakan Ketahanan Pangan", *Jurnal Pangan*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 2017.
- Mahbubani, Kishore and Rhoda Severino, "Asean The Way Foward", <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-sector/our-insights/asean-the-way-forward>, accessed on August 2018.
- Pantjar Simatupang, "Analisis Kritis terhadap Paradigma dan Kerangka Dasar Kebijakan Ketahanan Pangan Nasional", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 2007.
- Perum BULOG, "Sekilas RASKIN", http://www.bulog.co.id/sekilas_raskin.php, accessed on November 2018.
- Sapuan Gafar, "Memahami Krisis Beras", *Opini Kompas Cetak*, 18 Oktober 2018.
- Strategic Plan of the ASEAN Region's Action on Food Security 2009-2013.
- Sumaryanto, "Peranan KUD dalam pengadaan Gabah/Beras dalam Negeri", *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, Vol. 4., No. 2, 1986.

The Jakarta Post, "When Indonesia loses WTO appeal", <http://www.thejakartapost.com/academia/2018/08/09/when-indonesia-loses-wto-appeal.html>, accessed on November 2018.

Tribun News, "Bulog DIY Gelar Operasi Pasar untuk Stabilkan Harga Beras", <http://jogja.tribunnews.com/2015/01/06/bulog-diy-gelar-operasi-pasar-untuk-stabilkan-harga-beras>, accessed on November 2018.

Legal Documents

1945 Constitution of Republic of Indonesia.

Presidential Decree Number 19 of 1998 on the amendment of the Presidential Decree Number 50 of 1995 on Food Logistics Agency as it was subsequently amended to Presidential Decree Number 15 of 1997 [*Keputusan Presiden Nomor 19 Tahun 1998 tentang Perubahan Atas Keputusan Presiden Nomor 50 Tahun 1995 Tentang Badan Urusan Logistik Sebagaimana Telah Diubah Dengan Keputusan Presiden Nomor 15 Tahun 1997*].

Universal Declaration on Human Rights, 1948.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966.

The ASEAN Declaration 1967.

Treaty on Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, 1976.

Agreement on ASEAN Food Security Reserve, 1979.

ASEAN Charter 2007.

Treaty of the European Union, 2007.