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Abstract
Relational aspects between food sovereignty and food security are perceived as an important approach to cope with hunger problems rather than debating oppositional features between them. Both concepts deliver different approaches to food, yet it does not discourage attempts to reconcile them, currently, there are positive signs of such reconciliation at a global level. Proposed by La Via Campesina (international peasant organisation) as food sovereignty proponents, the food sovereignty narrative has been inserted into food security initiatives through the United Nation intergovernmental forum (High-Level Panel of Experts). The involvement of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) such as La Via Campesina in the intergovernmental forum is perceived as a fruitful method to deliver more concerted and systemic approaches to food, called food security governance.

Currently, Indonesian food law number 18/2012 adopts the integration of food sovereignty and food security. The Indonesian government feels the integration is a significant attempt to achieve food security objectives as Indonesia still experiences malnutrition and stunted growth of children. The integration entails some consequences; giving more space to CSOs especially peasant organisations in the governmental forum and prioritising small-scale farming. Thus, this thesis aims to analyse the integration of food sovereignty and food security in both conceptual and practical terms.

In-depth interviews have been conducted with policy makers, a peasant organisation representative, farmer activist, and academic expert. Different results are obtained, as policy makers perceive the integration is complementary, allowing the government to have more potential to innovate food policies. In contrast, both peasant organisation representative and farmer activist are pessimistic that the integration will generate Indonesian food policy to be more concerted and systematic. Additionally, evidence shows very little involvement of peasant organisations in governmental forums. Thus, integration of both concepts for the Indonesia case is premature and unlikely to bring food security governance.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Research problem

In 2008-9, high food and fuel prices were experienced in Indonesia. According to the World Food Programme (WFP) (2012), the impact of these unaffordable prices left approximately 87 million people vulnerable to food insecurity. During this period, 37% of Indonesia’s children under five years old (over 7.7 million children) became victims of stunted growth. In 2013, the WFP estimated that Indonesia had the fifth largest number of stunted children in the world. In 2002, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Indonesian government enacted a binding agreement at the World Food Summit (WFS). The Plan of Action required the Indonesian government to adopt policies and programmes to combat food insecurity (FAO, 2005). The Plan has yielded food policy that has been translated into law, government regulations and presidential degree, and the Plan has become one of the National Priorities in the country’s National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2010-2014 (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2013) and it is continued in RPJMN 2015-2019 (Bappenas, 2015). However, despite the Plan of Action’s mandate that it be implemented by the Indonesian government in partnership with civil society, benefits from such a partnership remain to be seen.

Although civil society activities in Indonesia are not as extensive as in developed countries, they are present. After the Suharto Era collapsed (1998 onward), civil society organisations (CSOs) bloomed (Harney & Olivia, 2003; Rahmawati, 2003; Hadi, 2014; Idea, n.d.), including peasant organisations (Rahmawati, 2003; Serikat Petani Indonesia (SPI), 2008). Numerous government systems have changed since the end of the 20th century, and decentralisation is now noticeable. Perhaps the biggest change has been freedom of speech, which has yielded the opportunity for CSOs and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) to take part in public affairs (Hadi, 2014). Nonetheless, public officials are still ambivalent about the political role of CSOs in general, and CSOs perceive themselves as opponents of governments (Hadi). Recent data from 2005 to 2009 indicates that CSOs’ engagement has slightly changed from street demonstration to more strategic approaches (e.g. lobbying governments, analysing draft government budgets or regulations, organising media campaigns and organising communities) (Hadi). The SPI or Indonesian Peasant Union which was established shortly after Suharto collapsed in 1998, has formed an alliance with the international peasant organisation La Via Campesina. Both organisations have adopted
the concept of ‘peasant rights’. SPI’s campaign is especially keen to improve the livelihood of peasants and integrate food sovereignty into policy (SPI, 2008).

The food security initiatives proposed by the Ministry of Agriculture in 2013 present three different frameworks: food sovereignty, food resilience and food security; these frameworks were adopted from Food Law number 8/2012, which is being employed as a tool to help establish the initiatives (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2013). Furthermore, intense debate has surrounded food security and food sovereignty among scholars. Many scholars, including Jarosz (2014), Hopma and Woods (2014), Patel (2009) and Edelman (2014a) agree that food security and food sovereignty express opposing views. Food security relies on corporate farming, biotechnology (Genetically Modified Organisms/GMOs) and patents, while food sovereignty proposes small-scale farming, sustainable agriculture and opposes patents. Nonetheless, Jarosz (2014) argues that food security and food sovereignty can be relational. Moreover, Jarosz (2014) believed that Belo Horizonte Municipality has integrated food security and food sovereignty, as stated on its Municipality Law; [the Municipality]:

Is committed to the concept of food sovereignty defined as the right of peoples to define their own food and agriculture policies, to protect and regulate their production and trade in such a manner as to secure sustainable development, to determine the degree of their autonomy and to eliminate dumping on the markets. (p.175)

In Brazil, the Belo Horizonte food security policy has successfully alleviated malnourishment among children under five years old by 75%, reduced child mortality by 65% and increased fruit and vegetable intake by 25% (World Future Council, 2009). In this sense, Bole Horizonte can be perceived as a successful alliance between food security and food sovereignty at the local level. Jarosz (2014) points out that, at the local level, food security goals may align easily with food sovereignty goals (e.g. ensuring democratic control over accessible, healthy, culturally appropriate and ecologically sustainable food for people). The challenge would be greater at the national and international level, as it is difficult to reach a consensus on GMOs while simultaneously ensuring the human right to food (Jarosz).

One aspect key to the success of the Belo Horizonte food security policy is the involvement of CSOs (World Future Council, 2009). McKeon (2015) also considers the involvement of CSOs, particularly peasant organisations, to play a significant part in building food security governance. However, the Indonesian government remains reluctant to involve peasant organisations in the design and implementation of policy and programmes. The government
has continued to rely upon top-down policy and vertical hierarchical tiers (central – provincial – city). This reluctance conflicts with policies such as Government Regulation no 68/1999, which are meant to foster the involvement of civil society in public affairs. Furthermore, integrating food sovereignty into food security policy is likely to entail a new paradigm in approaching food; as aforementioned, both concepts are perceived frequently as oppositional, therefore, reconciliation at both conceptual and practical levels from the perceptions of food actors (governments, peasant organisations, farmer and agrarian activists) are the objectives of this research.

Research questions

This dissertation poses two main research questions. The first focus is elaborating the integration of food sovereignty into food security, considering harmonisation at a practical level and for actors in the food system. Indonesian food law adopted the term of *food sovereignty* after ten years of food security initiatives being set in place in food policy. As Jarosz (2014) points out, the terms *food sovereignty* and *food security* are open to interpretation based on geography and scale. Notwithstanding, by putting food sovereignty into food law, the Indonesian government must have realised the need to promote small-scale farming and engage with civil society, particularly peasant organisations. The second research question is therefore to focus on the exploration of producers (farmers), consumers and peasant organisations in the Indonesian policy framework. These two research questions aim to address the problems stated above.

1. (a). How are the different notions; food sovereignty and food security, interpreted and applied by different actors?
   (b). Is an integrated focus useful to develop a more concerted and systemic approach to food?

2. (a). Is the Indonesian policy framework creating space for connecting the needs and aspirations of both producers (peasants and small-scale farmers) and consumers?
   (b). Is the Indonesian policy framework creating space for connecting the needs and aspirations of civil society engagement, particularly peasant organisations?

Scientific relevance

Indonesia has experienced food security since the era of colonialisation (The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Bappenas, Departemen Pertanian, DAI Food Policy Advisory Team, 2002). However, this issue has only been studied within the last two decades. Food security discourse with the Indonesia context, particularly in the
decentralisation era, has become a focus for scholars and researchers from international bodies such as the FAO, World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Academic studies discuss food security in terms of macro aspects such as economic growth and rice price stabilisation and also micro aspects such as achieving food security for poor households.

Nonetheless, there is a shortage of theoretically informed studies focusing on integrating two different frameworks into coherent policy: food security and food sovereignty. In addition, the roles of small-scale farmers and peasant organisations are contested in the achievement of food security. Therefore, this research hopefully will be able to fill the gap in academic literature and can help address problems emerging from the policy that is integrating two different frameworks; food law number 18/2012.

The structure of the dissertation

This dissertation starts with a brief exploration of new Indonesian food law that attempts to reconcile two big concepts; food sovereignty and food security. Both concepts are still the subject of ongoing debate among food and agriculture scholars and activists. The dispute from peasant organisations to integrating food sovereignty into food security initiatives used by the Indonesian government underlies the research problem. In chapter 2 definitions of food sovereignty and food security are given alongside the debate surrounding these concepts. This chapter also presents the food security governance concept as a new concept offered to bridge oppositional aspects between food security and food sovereignty.

In order to guide and justify this research, the philosophy, research approach, method and strategy are presented in chapter 3. Furthermore, as this research uses Indonesia as a case study, an overview of Indonesian food security consisting of its history, politics, governance system and policy and peasant organisations’ history and its part in food security are also discussed in chapter 4. Chapter 5 presents discussion based on research questions. Interview results provide different perceptions among policy makers, activists of peasant organisations and researchers upon the ideology of the Indonesian government towards food policy, the governance system and implementation mechanism of food policy. Finally, chapter 6 is dedicated to conclude this research and also offers recommendations and future research.
Chapter 2
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of research should be selected based on its relevance to the research objectives and questions. Since this research will explore food security and food sovereignty, the most appropriate conceptual frameworks to use are those of food security and food sovereignty. These, particularly the food sovereignty framework, are quite new; there is no single, fixed theoretical framework. However, numerous literature on the concept have offered in-depth discourses.

The food security and food sovereignty networks are frequently viewed as oppositional to each other, especially by proponents of food sovereignty. Scanbacher (2010) believes that food sovereignty versus food security is a ‘global conflict’ which is characterised by ‘fundamental antagonism’ (p.ix) (as cited in Edelman, 2014a). Fairbain (2010) feels food sovereignty and food security are ‘counter frame’ (pp.26-27) while Martinez-Torrez (2010, pp.169-170) argues that they are part of the ‘conflict between models’ (both as cited in Edelman, 2014a, p.965). Discussing these two frameworks as oppositional is tempting, as this concept has been the subject of numerous articles by scholars, and it is easier to perceive the Indonesian food security policy from the perspective of food sovereignty. Some peasant organisations, having analysed Indonesian food security using a food sovereignty point of view, have pointed out that the food security and food sovereignty concepts are definitely oppositional and even impossible to integrate (Danu, 2014).

Despite the existing criticism, the current attempt of the Indonesian government to integrate sovereignty into food security policy is an interesting case that is well suited to analysis using a relational framework, as the notion of a relational food security and food sovereignty has been much discussed by scholars. The city of Belo Horizonte, as an example indicating that sovereignty can be successfully integrated into food security policy in practice, supports both this research and the Indonesian government’s efforts. In short, a relational framework, instead of an oppositional framework, is appropriate and selected for this study of Indonesia’s case.

The evolution of food security

Food security is considered as a flexible concept. One decade ago, when the concept first appeared in academia, approximately 200 definitions of food security were introduced (FAO, 2003). The definitions were shaped by research and policy usage (FAO). Initially, the food security focus was primarily on food supply problems in response to the global food crisis in
the mid-1970s. Afterwards, international negotiation led to the World Food Conference in 1974, where world leaders established an institution to promote food security (FAO).

Food security was officially defined at the WFS in 1974 as ‘the availability at all times of adequate world food supplies of basic foodstuffs to sustain a steady expansion of food consumption and to offset fluctuations in production and prices’ (FAO, 2003, p.27). The term was redefined by the FAO in 1983 to address vulnerable people’s security of access to available supplies. The shift in definition entailed balancing the supply and demand. As the discourse of food security was shaped by research and policy usage, the report of the World Bank in 1986 relating to hunger and poverty supported the introduction of measures to relieve food insecurity associated with structural poverty and low income (FAO). Thus, the concept of food security is further expounded in terms of: ‘Access of all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life’ (FAO, p.27).

In the mid-1990s, food security focus shifted from individual to global concern. The scope of concern enlarged to incorporate food safety and nutritional balances. In 1994, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) identified food security to be an aspect of human security and established an action framework regarding food security in order to combat hunger and deprivation. Thus, the addressing of food security as an aspect of human security in the UNDP Human Development Report in 1994 added a more complex meaning of food security. Introduced in the 1996 World Food Summit, this definition is as follows:

Food security, at the individual, household, national, regional and global levels [is achieved] when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. (FAO, 2003, p.28)

In this definition, food security is recognised as a tripartite concept reflecting the criteria of availability, access and stability. The FAO also stated that food security is essentially a phenomenon at the individual level, with the ultimate focus on the nutritional status of the individual household member. The FAO (2003) therefore added the following working definition of food security and food insecurity:

Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Household food security is the application of this concept to the family level, with individuals within households as the focus of concern … Food insecurity exists when people do not have adequate physical, social or economic access to food as defined above. (p.29)
**Ideology of food security**

Jarosz (2014) pointed out that food security manifests neo-liberal globalisation policies, which is palpable when food security is progressively intertwined with the neo-liberalism of developmentalism and economic growth. As a proto-hegemonic framework, food security is deployed by most worldwide organisations, including the FAO as the main supporting organisation, state governments, especially in the global north and transnational agribusinesses as bodies to promote technology, markets and political solutions (Jarosz, 2011 cited in Hopma & Woods, 2014). Hopma and Woods (2014) argued that the emergence of food security concerns indicated the end of the post-war food regime.

The food regime itself is identified as the ‘political structuring of world capitalism, and its organisation of agricultures to provision labour and/or consumers in such a way as to reduce wage costs and enhance commercial profits’ (McMichael, 2013, p.8) quoted in McKeon, 2015, p.11). Furthermore, McKeon (2015) explained that the food regime was supported by free trade, free enterprise and development aids to achieve modernisation. Food security was initiated by global north governments as a tool to prevent food shortage and urbanisation (Jarosz, 2014; Hopma & Woods, 2014). It used a combination of state regulation, private sector innovation and international trade to support the industrialisation of agriculture and the market of food supply. Examples of actions taken to uphold the food regime include productivist policies such as the Common Agriculture Policy in Europe, the Agricultural Act in Britain in 1947 and the Farm Bill in the US in 1949. This productivism strategy successfully secured domestic food supply in the global north (Hopma & Woods, 2014).

Rising awareness of the hunger crisis in parts of Africa and Asia in the 1970s shifted public attention from food security through domestic food supply to global food security as it was defined by the FAO in 1996 (Hopma & Woods, 2014). Hopma and Woods postulated that the initial response was to export and extend the principles and strategies of the regime. This included spreading the modernisation of agriculture to developing countries, distributing global north surplus though World Food Programmes and negotiating agri-food in the international free market. To conclude, Jarosz (2014 cited in Edelman, 2014a) summarises that food security is characteristically associated with technocratic and productivist approaches to developments related to food sufficiency for individuals, households and nations. In this sense, food security is closely associated with developmentalist organisations such as the World Bank, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and WFP.


**Criticisms of food security**

Regardless of the human rights aspect and good governance proposed by the concept of food security, food security is better known as part of the neo-liberal agenda. As mentioned before, food security has been described as technocratic and neo-liberal development focused on dealing with surges in production and quantifying the supply and demand associated with the agribusiness and governance of national and international organisations. Furthermore, food security addresses the hunger caused by poverty in the sense that people who lack the power to purchase food must go without it (Jarosz, 2014). Accordingly, Jarosz argued, instead of assigning the responsibility to alleviate poverty to the government, food security discourse imposes the responsibility on the poor people, asking them to solve their own problems by making more money by, for instance, labouring in garment factories or on factory farms.

In developmentalist ideology, food security stresses economic growth in order to alleviate poverty and increase the people’s purchasing power (Timmer, 2004). It is not surprising, then, that most of the recommendations given by the OECD and The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to Indonesia and other developing countries suggest boosting economic growth and replacing all food self-sufficiency policies by giving more space for import (OECD, 2012).

Criticism also comes from Patel (2009), who emphasised that the definition of food security refuses to discuss the social control present in the food system. This raises the question of what powers decide how food security should be obtained. It is entirely possible for people to achieve food security in prison or under dictatorship. Albeit, Jarosz (2014) and Candel (2014) stressed that food security is also quite likely if the country places good governance into practice. Nonetheless, Patel focused on the necessity of acknowledging food security to be a human right that can only be achieved in a system in which food sovereignty is guaranteed. In other words, ‘food sovereignty is a foil to the prevailing notions of food security’ or a ‘precondition to genuine food security’ (Patel, 2009, p.665). However, due to reluctance to discuss methods through which food security was to be accomplished, the language of food sovereignty in international discourse is embedded within the subject of rights and democracies (Patel, 2009).

**Food sovereignty discourse**

Claeys (2013), as a scholar of food sovereignty, argued that the initial aim of food sovereignty is to respond to the lack of support from the global south states for agriculture
and the arrival of imported food from the US. In contrast, Edelman (2014b) views food sovereignty as it was originally defined in the Mexican government’s 1983 National Food Programme, in which La Via Campesina was adopted and refashioned. Regardless of where the term food sovereignty comes from, Claeys (2013) added that in the 1970s food sovereignty was understood as ‘national food security’, which was connected with ‘the right to continue being producers’ (p.3). Thus, the human right for food is at the heart of La Via Campesina’s struggle.

La Via Campesina developed the food sovereignty definition in Nyéléni 2007 (cited in Patel, 2009) as follows:

Food sovereignty is the right of people to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agricultural system. It puts those who produce, distribute and consume food at the heart of food system and policies rather than the demands of market and corporations. It defends the interest and inclusion of the next generation. It offers a strategy to resist and dismantle the current corporate trade and regime, and direction for food, farming, pastoral and fisheries system determined by local producers. Food sovereignty prioritizes local and national economies and markets and empowers peasant and family farmer-driven agriculture, artisanal fishing, pastoralist-led grazing, and food production, distribution, and consumption based on environmental, social and economic sustainability. Food sovereignty promotes transparent trade that guarantees just income to all peoples and the rights of consumers to control their food and nutrition. It ensures that the rights to use and manage our lands, territories, water and seeds, livestock and biodiversity are in the hand of those of us who produce food. Food sovereignty implies new social relations free of oppression and inequality between men and women, peoples, racial groups, social classes and generation. (p.666)

In response to this definition of food sovereignty, Jarosz (2014) and McMichael (2009) described food sovereignty as counter to neo-liberal practices and globalisation of food and agriculture. In addition, grassroots movements, peasants and small farmers demand a direct influence upon agriculture policies at all levels (local, national and international). Bernstein (2013) framed food sovereignty as a comprehensive confrontation of corporate industrialised agriculture and its impact on the ecology and advocacy of the peasant as the basic unit of a sustainable and just food system.

As food sovereignty emerges from social movements and emphasises right-based language, it is provoking discussion and debate among scholars. Activists of food sovereignty in alliance with La Via Campesina are focused on lobbying intergovernmental organisations (e.g. the UN) to accept the concept of food sovereignty in their food security global framework. Heated debate thus surrounds the topic of right-based language and practical issues such as global trade for commodity farmers (e.g. those of cocoa, tea, coffee, bananas,
and so on), different sized farms and the various localities. The following section will outline the debate and criticism surrounding food sovereignty.

**Food sovereignty debates and criticism**

As a discourse that has been built to counter another framework (food security), food sovereignty still seeks its own form. Debates among scholars relating to its definition and what it entails have not finished yet. One interesting argument raised by Nicholson (2009) is as follows:

> Food sovereignty is not just resistances, as there are thousands of resistances, but also proposals that come from social movements, and not just peasant movements. From environmental movements, among others, come many initiatives that develop proposals of recuperation, of rights, of policies. This is also an autonomous and independent process. There is no central committee, and food sovereignty is not the patrimony of any particular organisation. It’s not La Vía Campesina’s project, or even just a peasants’ project. (cited in McMichael, 2009, p.678-680)

In this sense, food sovereignty is not owned by La Via Campesina or peasant organisations or agricultural issues, but rather perceived as a holistic concept that embraces wider aspects related to rights. This conception asserts food sovereignty as a social movement that is diametrically opposite to food security; as mentioned previously, food security is close to the technocratic and developmentalist approaches. However, some scholars such as Edelman, Jarosz and Clapp have acknowledged that food security and food sovereignty are not utterly oppositional. Edelman (2014b) pointed out that the concepts have slippage and overlap, and Jarosz (2014) explained the relations of these concepts in terms of geography and scales. Discussion about these relationships will be presented in the following section. Debate surrounds food sovereignty’s origin and its practical and conceptual limitations as well as what it would take to implement food sovereignty now and in the future in economic, political and ecological contexts; these debates are worth noting in order to understand how food security and food sovereignty converge (Edelman, 2014a).

Heated debate focuses on long-distance and international trade. Food sovereignty faces the paradigm of trying to localise economies in an age of globalisation; the relevant struggles have manifested in efforts to reduce food miles, promote direct marketing and establish geographical origin indications (Edelman, 2014b; Edelman et al., 2014, Hopma & Woods, 2014). It raised critical questions about the small producers whose livelihood depends on export trade (e.g. tea, coffee and cocoa). In response, proponents of food sovereignty explicitly call for tariff protection and ask to end the global agreement of institutions interfering with the sustainability and sovereignty of the food system (Edelman, 2014b). Edelman (2014b) argued that proponents of food sovereignty tend to neglect how small
holders ploughing export crops might be threatened by plunging income if they are obliged to cultivate staple foods for local markets. Furthermore, Edelman raised additional questions: what if small holders want to sell their products to other sides of the country or abroad? What if small holders become successful and have large farms? Are there any limitations for farms and farm sizes, products and technology mixes, long-distance and global trade? The food sovereignty advocates hardly consider the regulatory apparatus for managing these questions.

The second aspect that has attracted scholars' concern is the question of 'right'. Patel (2009) argued that the language of 'right' is not well suited for food sovereignty, as 'right does not come cheap and cannot be summoned out of thin air' (Bentham, 2002 cited in Patel, 2009, p.123). Food sovereignty proponents argue that a minority of privileged people has constructed the modern food system, and the system is illegitimate. Thus food sovereignty demands change throughout the entire food system from the bottom up (Hopma & Woods, 2014). Indeed, Patel (2009) noted that 'rights need a guarantor, responsible for implementing a concomitant system of duties and obligations' (p.668). Food sovereignty embeds anti-statist and anarchist tendencies that are not well suited to the 'right to have rights' (Patel, 2009, p.668), which, according to Arendt (1967 as cited in Patel, 2009) requires the state to be the guarantor. As Patel (2009) stated:

> When the call is for, variously, nations, peoples, regions, and states to craft their own agrarian policy, there is a concomitant call for spaces of sovereignty. Food sovereignty has its own geographies, one determined by specific histories and contours of resistance. To demand a space of food sovereignty is to demand specific arrangements to govern territory and space. At the end of the day, the power of rights talk is that rights imply a particular burden on a specified entity – the state. In blowing apart the notion that the state has a paramount authority, by pointing to the multivalent hierarchies of power and control that exist within the world food system, food sovereignty paradoxically displaces one sovereign, but remains silent about the others. To talk of a right to anything, after all, summons up a number of preconditions which food sovereignty, because of its radical character, undermines. (p.668)

What disturbed Arendt (1967) is that people who were not covered by territory (e.g. refugees and people stripped of nation-state membership) and people with a nation but no state (e.g. Palestinians) had no entity to guarantee their human rights (as cited in Patel, 2009).

Echoing the prerogative to have rights debates, Edelman et al. (2014) asked who would administer the food sovereignty. Trauger (2014) as cited in Edelman et al. (2014) postulated that there are two dimensions to the debate: 'the role in food sovereignty of the states' and
‘the role of markets’ (p.920). She argued that food sovereignty might implement the radical idea and movement within the existing state, an action that she refers to as ‘a kind of civil disobedience’ (p.920). This circumstance possibly desires ‘re-territorialize[d] space’ or ‘overlapping sovereignty’ (p.920). With regard to ‘the role of markets’, Van der Ploeg (2014) cited in Edelman et al. (2014) perceived that food sovereignty is an alternative in the market economy that gives the peasants an opportunity to produce for the market without being dependent on the market.

**Relational analysis of food security and food sovereignty**

As aforementioned, some authors, including Edelman, Jarosz and Clapp, have argued that food security and food sovereignty have a relational dimension. Each of the three authors noted focused on different aspects. Edelman (2014b), for example, highlighted historical evidence in the form of the first statement of Via Campesina in the 1996 Rome World Food Summit, which he pointed out clearly marks that ‘food sovereignty is a pre-condition to genuine food security’ (Via Campesina, 1996 as cited in Patel, 2009, p.665). Edelman also explained that the most visible slippage between food security and food sovereignty concepts was in the 1996 NGO Forum Statement to the World Food Summit. The Statement was titled: ‘Profit for few or food for all’ and subtitled ‘Food sovereignty and security to eliminate the globalization of hunger’. The statement produced six elements that concern farmers’ rights to genetic recourses and agrarian reform; local and regional food systems; agro-ecological paradigms; food security for vulnerable people; participation of people and NGOs; and international law for food sovereignty over macro-economic policies and trade liberalisation. Furthermore, Edelman argued that the latest definition of food sovereignty was declared in the 2007 Nyeleni forum; the definition states, ‘Food sovereignty is the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through an ecologically sound and sustainable method…’ (as cited in Edelman, 2014a, p.967). The words ‘healthy and culturally appropriate’ are also part of the FAO definition of food security. Thus, Edelman concluded that food sovereignty in original and contemporary expressions interconnects significantly. Indeed, to some extent food sovereignty converges with food security. In addition, Edelman believed that ‘both concepts had been protean concepts, frequently imprecise, always contested and in ongoing processes of semantic and political evolution’ (p. 123). Accordingly, Clapp (2014) mainly presented arguments that food security and food sovereignty discourses correlate according to each one’s orientation on food production or, as Clapp put it, both are *productionist*. 
Another argument presented by Jarosz (2014) is that both concepts can be relational. She began with the International Assessment of Agriculture Knowledge Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) report published in 2009, which claims that food security and food sovereignty require ‘agricultural knowledge, technology and science’ to eliminate ‘malnutrition – poor, health – low productivity cycle’ (Jarosz, 2014, p.175). Further, the IAASTD report explicitly states that the two concepts are not oppositional but interconnected frameworks that embrace access, distribution, security and equity. Accordingly, the Committee on World Food Security of the FAO in 2012 drafted the Global Strategic Framework (GSF) for Food and Nutrition, which recognised the necessity for an agreement on inserting the definition of food sovereignty into the GFS document. When there is disagreement related to GMOs’ contribution to food security, and while it is still the government’s responsibility to safeguard the human right to food, such convergence is unlikely to happen. Nonetheless, the FAO’s newest Director General, José Graziano da Silva, the former Minister of Food Security in Brazil and founder of the Zero Hunger programmes, underlined the importance of these concepts converging. Notably, he associated the concepts of food sovereignty with food security in his programmes and policies. Belo Horizonte enacted a food security policy in 1993 that was committed to the concept of food sovereignty. Jarosz (2014) noted the success of the food security policy of Belo Horizonte as an example ‘that food sovereignty and food security discourse are related in discourse and through practice within an urban context’ (p.176).

Jarosz (2014) argued that the relations between food security and food sovereignty vary in geography and scale. As a result, it is necessary to understand the relational and oppositional aspects of the discourses regarding place; each country has its own unique cultural, political and economic situation. At the local level, food security may easily align with food sovereignty goals (e.g. ensuring access to resources, gaining healthy, culturally appropriate and ecologically sustainable food for all). However, disagreement about GMOs and who should hold the responsibility to ensure the human right to food makes these frameworks remain oppositional. Regarding the success in Belo Horizonte, Brazil has given some idea as to what circumstances are necessary for the effective integration of the two concepts. The food security policy was enacted in 1993 in Municipal Law No 6.352, 15/07/1993; it featured the principal ‘that all citizens have the right to adequate quantity and quality of food throughout their lives, and that it is the duty of governments to guarantee this right’ (SMAB, n.d., as cited in Rocha, 2001, para.5). This principal breaks down into three main actions that are carried out by the Municipal Secretariat of Supplies
(Secretaria Municipal de Abastecimento – SMAB). First, the SMAB ‘assist[s] poor families and individuals at risk to supplement their food consumption needs’; second, the SMAB supports the private sector in the food market; and third, the SMAB strives to increase food production and domestic supply (Rocha, 2001).

Additionally, Rocha stressed the consensus among politicians that food security is a human right and that, therefore, the responsibility to ensure this right falls to the government. As it is explicitly stated in the SMAB’s documents (n.d.) ‘we must guarantee healthy, sufficient, and constant nourishment to those who are consumers and to those who, lacking buying power, cannot even be included in this category’ (cited in Rocha, 2001, para. 30).

With the idea of giving the responsibility to ensure the human right to food to the government and promoting agroecology as a way of farming (Rocha, 2001), the food security policy of Belo Horizonte Brazil has encompassed the food sovereignty framework. As Jarosz (2014) argued, the basic difference between food sovereignty and food security comes down to GMO issues and the notion of the responsibility to ensure the human right to food. This rift exists due to an absence of strong opposition from the established powers (i.e. the agro-industrial food manufacturers and retailers), as these powers do not view Belo Horizonte as a serious threat to the political-economic norm in the country (Rocha, 2001). However, it would be a different story if the food security policy of Belo Horizonte were copied throughout Brazil; in this case, tremendous revolution would be unleashed. This might support the argument why integrating sovereignty into food security is likely to happen at the local/municipal level.

Jarosz (2014) then argued there are other basic differences between the two concepts that make it difficult to achieve convergence. Food sovereignty maintains that poor and wealthy countries alike are affecting the global food system in a way that is making social relations unjust, oppressive and discriminative. Food security considers the scale of this relational analysis, but it does not include a discussion of social change; as Claeys (2013) observed, international arenas such as the Committee on World Food Security are unlikely to invite such a discussion. Jarosz continued by stating that the food security and the food sovereignty frameworks can be oppositional, intersectional or parallel depending on the system of governance, power relations and particular geohistories at hand. Accordingly, food security and food sovereignty discourse and practice may successfully enable food access and ensure the production and quality of food for individuals and households, but may make only a limited contribution to transforming the existing national and
international political economies of food and agrarian development. Jarosz (2014) postulated the following:

Understanding the histories of governance at national and international levels as well as the dynamic operation of power through and across the political economy of food networks is crucial in assessing and understanding how food security and food sovereignty discourse are embedded within the political, social, economic and cultural dimensions of household, landscape, and nation. (p.123)

To conclude, Jarosz believed that food sovereignty is not an inevitable pre-condition of food security, as food sovereignty depends on a model of land access and ownership, the politics of food provision and consumption and the characteristics of culture at a local, regional and national level. The meanings of these concepts, she argued, are created and embedded in life experience.

**Food security governance: Does it represent a relational aspect of food security and food sovereignty?**

Another heated discussion features food security governance. Good governance was recognised by Jarosz (2014) as the premise upon which the supply and accessibility of food increases through purchase on the global market or upon which local production increases due to investment in productivist agriculture at the international and national levels. Jarosz’s opinion is strengthened with the recent evidence related to famine in Iraq, Bosnia and Malawi, which occurred as a result of the flawed democratisation, difficult relations between governments and donors, market liberalisation and lack of accountability of the government (Jarosz). Echoing Jarosz, Candel (2014) argued that food security cannot be achieved without advanced strategies involving governments, companies, NGOs and citizens. Consequently, Candel interlinked food security as defined by the FAO in 2003 with the governance system. Escamilla (2012) argued that the notion that food security is a human right brings about the concept of food security governance, which in turn is used as a tool to implement this right.

According to the FAO (2011), food security governance is comprised of ‘Formal and informal rules and processes through which interests are articulated, and decisions [made] relevant to food security in a country’; these rules, processes and decisions are ‘made, implemented and enforced on behalf of members of society’ (cited in Escamilla, 2012, p.120). McKeon (2015) clearly stated that ‘the right to adequate food’ is a component of both food security and food sovereignty (p.81-85). However, the ‘right’ approach of food security and food sovereignty, according to Jarosz (2014), has different timings and definitions in each framework.
The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Right (ICESCR) in 1976 committed to the recognition of ‘the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food’ and ‘the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger’ (McKeon, 2015, p.81). Jarosz (2014) argued that food security acknowledges the sovereign rights of nations to endorse food security related policies; unfortunately, this national sovereignty is eroded by the ruling of the WTO, as the ruling does not support local and regional food self-sufficiency. In contrast, McKeon (2015) focused on the domestic country itself, which usually does not promote the ‘right to food’ for its people.

McKeon then pointed to the example of the Intergovernmental Working Group, which involved the participation of non-state actors, working under the flag of food sovereignty; in this case, society was successful in lobbying intergovernmental organisations to extend the legal interpretation of the right to food from simply access to food to access to food resources and from individuals to collectivities (McKeon, 2015). Involving civil society in the UN intergovernmental forum through Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) has brought about reform in terms of the view of food systems and accompanying reforms to the document of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). The CFS acknowledges important features, for instance, understanding the structural nature of food crisis causes and recognising the main victims to be small-scale farmers. Additionally, the CFS’s mission explicitly promotes the right to adequate food and recognises civil society organisations including small-scale food producers as full participants in the UN conference. The CFS also supports setting up the GSF as a guiding strategy for national food security, agricultural investment and trade regulation as well as bringing together the expertise of farmers, indigenous people and practitioners and the knowledge of academics and researchers in the UN High-Level Panel of Experts (McKeon, 2015).

McKeon (2015) proposed that involving civil society in intergovernmental forums in order to formulate guidance for national food security action plans together is representative of the food security governance model. Candel (2014) expressed the similar opinion that poor governance could be a more significant factor than natural conditions regarding food insecurity. Poor governance, when paired with lack of institutional capacity, conflict, poor policy design and lagging implementation, can impose serious harm on the production and distribution of healthy food (Candel). As food security is a complex and multidimensional issue that is influenced by a wide array of drivers and food system activities, it is difficult to determine the main drivers of food insecurity. Food security governance is dispersed across
domains and sectors as well as spatial access, i.e. global, national, regional, local, community, household and individual. Moreover, in emphasising the importance of global institutional food security governance for effective and democratic governance systems, Candel also argued CSOs play crucial roles in addressing food insecurity at all levels.

However, Claeys (2013) argued that La Via Campesina perceives the CFS as not likely to bring social change since trade issues are not an attribute on the CFS’s agendas. Additionally, La Via Campesina is ambivalent about its involvement in the CFS since La Via Campesina is actively participating in social society working groups that are proposing social changes regarding issues such as lands, agriculture investment, gender and nutrition.

**Operationalisation of integrating food security and food sovereignty in the global food governance**

The discussion surrounding the oppositional and relational aspects of food security and food sovereignty seems to have resolved its practical issues, since the CFS has reconciled the two concepts. This is indicated by the CFS’s willingness to extend the legal interpretation of the right to food from simply *access to food* to *access to food resources*, by the CFS’s efforts to ensure that this right is recognised as a government responsibility and by the CFS’s acknowledgement of civil society organisations, small-scale farmers and indigenous people on the UN High-Level Panel Expert (McKeon, 2015).

Additionally, the CFS produced the GSF for Food and Nutrition as guidance for national food security action plans that are to be negotiated and adopted by governments (McKeon, 2015). The question of whether or not integration of food sovereignty into food security policy is sufficient can be mostly answered by the civil society movement La Via Campesina. Boincean et al. (2013, p.11) explained that ‘the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition is a partnership between G8, the African Union, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), its Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), participating African governments and private sector companies’. The La Via Campesina is concerned that the New Alliance G8 will use approaches (e.g. privatisation and commercialisation of seed sectors; revision of land laws) and procedures to secure investments and offer investments to agriculture sectors. The New Alliance is therefore worried that the human right of food security and nutrition will be undermined by business issues (Boincean et al.). Apart from the La Via Campesina’s concerns about the New Alliance partnership agreement with countries, the GSF living documents are a big step towards integrating food sovereignty into food security. Reconciliation at the global level may yet be
achieved, though the political, cultural and socio-economic situation from country to country is different. Bringing the GSF agenda to the national level is a big challenge. It is questionable whether governments will be able to enact new laws, as the initiatives in the GSF documents might hurt the actors in domestic food systems, including agribusiness corporations, seed sector industries and giant food retail chains. As Rocha (2001) stated about the Belo Horizonte case, the lack of opposition from the existing food chain power is one of the reasons why the food security policy in Belo Horizonte is succeeding. Additionally, McKeon (2015) argued that the institutionalisation of food sovereignty and ensuring the right to food at global, national, regional and local levels are complex affairs. Even when the legal framework and policies are established, the implementation still tends to lag behind.

To conclude, at a global level, integrating food sovereignty into food security is likely to happen at both conceptual and practical stages. In terms of the local level, a famous example is given by Belo Horizonte, where advocates have been able to implement food security policies and initiatives. The national level is embedded in various and complex political, economic and socio-cultural interests, alongside with little in promoting human rights (McKeon, 2015), and lack of good governance, particularly in developing countries (Candel, 2014) will face major challenges in implementing the binding agreement of the GSF. Furthermore, although the literature review presents reviews of food sovereignty, food security and food security governance narrative, this research utilises relational analysis between food security and food sovereignty proposed by Jarosz (2014) and food security governance for exploring and analysing the Indonesia case.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Research philosophy
Understanding the research philosophy will provide understanding of the way in which the research is conducted (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Choosing ontology and epistemology as two major ways of thinking about the research philosophy for the study approach will help explain and justify the methodological choice, strategy and data collection techniques (Bryman, 2008; Saunders et al., 2009). Ontology is defined as a metaphysical study of the way the world operates, while epistemology is what established appropriate knowledge in the subject of study (Bryman, 2008). To answer the research problem, the ontology for this research is social constructionism. This philosophy views reality as being constructed socially by interaction among social actors who construct and re-construct the complex array of phenomena (Saunders et al., 2009), whilst, the epistemology of the research is interpretivism. Interpretivism requires an understanding of the different roles between humans as social actors who also understand the world from their own point of view (Saunders et al.). Indeed, to dovetail both its epistemological and ontological standpoints, this research focuses on the actors’ perceptions and interpretations of food policy and their interactions at a practical level are critical aspects in the understanding of the extent to which different frameworks can be integrated into coherent policy.

Research approach
The inductive approach is most used in this research since there is little existing literature especially related to Indonesia as a study case. Saunders et al. (2009) comment that the inductive approach is appropriate when researchers are likely to use data to formulate theory. Indeed, this research utilises theoretical frameworks from food security, food sovereignty and food security governance discourse to obtain understanding and to design the interviews, and then develops a robust theory from results of interviews. As integrating food sovereignty into the topic of food security is quite new in Indonesia, and nature of food policy itself is embeded in locality, views of participants in a social setting are appropriate sources to answer research questions. Nevertheless, the author is aware that the inductive approach is likely to be much more protracted, therefore this research does not set aside the deductive approach: food security, food sovereignty and food governance frameworks assist
the author to analyse interview results. Thus, utilising both deductive and inductive approaches generates more convincing answers to the research questions and objectives.

**Research method**

For the data collection, this research was conducted in a qualitative nature. Qualitative data is non-numeric data or has not been quantified (Saunders et al., 2009). Furthermore, qualitative data encompasses a wide array of data, from the list of respondents, online questionnaires, to more complex data such as transcripts of in-depth interviews or entire policy documents (Saunders et al.). Since this research seeks to explore the integration of different frameworks into coherent food policy, conducting interviews and using documents to gain data and understanding are reasonable choices to achieve the research objectives.

**Research strategy**

Saunders et al.’s research onion (2009) showed that there are at least eight research strategies: narrative inquiry, grounded theory, action research, ethnography, case study, archive research, survey and experiment. Among those strategies, the case study is chosen as the research strategy. The case study is postulated by Robson (2002) as ‘a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence’ (as cited in Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2003, p. 93)

Interpreting Robson’s (2002) concept in relation to this research, integrating different frameworks to create a coherent food policy is a contemporary phenomenon investigated in the Indonesian context. Moreover, actors’ perceptions of food policy are inevitably tied to the local political, socio-economy and cultural situation. Therefore, the specific context is better elaborated using the case study approach.

Rowley (n.d.) explains two types of case study: holistic vs embedded. Where research concerns an organisation as a whole or one unit of analysis, the holistic case study is an appropriate approach. Conversely, if research also concerns the units in an organisation, the organisation is treated as an embedded case study. This research concerns Indonesia as a whole, without breaking down the analysis into provincial/city level, therefore, this research applies the holistic approach.

Indonesia is selected as the study case for two reasons. First, Indonesia accommodates two emerging notions, food security and food sovereignty in the food policy and is trying to implement it at a national scale, an attempt that is admittedly difficult. Moreover, Indonesia is one of the developing countries that gets attention from the FAO in terms of eliminating
hunger, malnourishment and stunted growth in children. In addition it has a very active peasant organisation (SPI) in the international arena, as in 1999-2000 the very first draft of the declaration of La Via Campesina was expounded during village level consultation with peasant communities in Indonesia (Claeys, 2013). Second, for practical considerations in terms of language and better understanding of the cultural approach, as the author is Indonesian, therefore, it is convenient to conduct interviews in the mother language and analyse documents.

**Data collection**

Corresponding with the research nature and research questions, the data that needs to be collected is qualitative. Saunders et al. (2009) explained that qualitative data is non-numeric (words) data. This research uses exploratory studies, which according to Robson (2002, as cited in Saunders et al., 2009, p.139) explores ‘what is happening; to seek new insights; to ask questions and to assess phenomena in a new light’. This echoes with the aims of this research, as the food policy is enacted in 2012 and imposed a year later, there is a high possibility that even the bureaucrats are still trying to understand the context of the policy, thus it would be opportune to explore what happens with the policy at conceptual and practical levels and also in interactions among the actors.

Furthermore, Saunders et al. (2009) added that exploratory studies may be conducted through literature search, interviews with subject experts or by conducting focus group discussions. Whereas numerous food security and food sovereignty literature are available, those frameworks are quite “new” and there is no single fixed theory about food security and food sovereignty. However, with the intensive discourse surrounding the food security and food sovereignty concepts among scholars, activists and academic-activists, the literature provided are profound. Yet, because this research is applied to the Indonesian case, it will be necessary to conduct interviews, as there is very limited literature for the Indonesian context. Therefore, this research will utilise two data collections, interviews of experts and documents.

**Respondents**

According to Saunders et al. (2009) the selection of samples aims to answer the research questions and achieve the research objectives. Since this research has a qualitative nature the samples cannot be selected based on a statistically random basis (does not have sampling frame) thus it applies non-probability samples (Saunders et al., 2009). The alternative way to select samples for this kind of research is based on the subjective judgement of the
researcher which is guided by research questions and objectives (Saunders et al.). Echoing research questions that place emphasis on the food policy and actors involved in the surrounding issues, this research applies purposive sampling that highlights the appropriate focus (Saunders et al.). As mentioned previously, the food security and food sovereignty frameworks have limited literature in the Indonesian context, and for the new enacted food policy, therefore, the appropriate sampling technique is expert sampling (Laerd, 2012). Expert sampling selects expertise from specific subjects (Laerd, 2012), this has no rule regarding the sample size as it is like other sampling techniques in purposive sampling (Saunders et al., 2009).

Food policy is dependent on its numerous actors, but for the purposes of this research, investigation is limited to prominent food policy actors in food security and food sovereignty issues. As expert sampling has no rule to determine the sample size, the size follows that advocated by Guest et al (2006, as cited in Saunders et al., 2009, p.235) that if ‘the research aim is to understand the commonalities within a fairly homogenous group, 12 in-depth interviews should suffice’. Although the research aim is not to understand the commonalities, the size given by Guest et al. (2006, as cited in Saunders et al., 2009) is a reasonable size to address research questions and objectives.

As this research utilises Indonesia’s case, understanding food policy in the Indonesian context is crucial. Additionally, discussing the evolving food policy with regard to the political situation, socio-economic and governance system since the colonialism era until the cabinet of the newly elected President in 2014, helps to answer the research questions. Discussion of this part is based on secondary data; policy documents, website articles and publications.

**Semi-structured interview and documents**

Semi-structured interviews are conducted as primary data, compared to structured interviews, semi-structured are non-standardised (Saunders et al., 2009), but still have clear lists of the issues to be addressed and questions to be answered (Denscombe, 2007). Interview questions are different from one stakeholder to another since their role in food policy is also different. Albeit this research applied semi-structured interviews, questions sometimes were developed depending on the answers given by respondents.

Participants were chosen based on their role or participation in Indonesian food policy. In total, 13 potential respondents were contacted. They were officials from the Serikat Petani Indonesia (Indonesian Peasant Union/SPI), Aliansi Petani Indonesia (Indonesian Peasant
Alliance/API), Agency for Food Security (Director for the Centre of Food Availability and Vulnerability, Director for the Centre of Food Diversification Consumption, Director for the Centre of Food Distribution and Reserves), Research and Development for food security of the Ministry of Agriculture, Bappenas (National Planning and Development Bureau), BULOG (National Logistic Agency), World Food Programme (WFP) Indonesia, HKTI (Himpunan Kerukunan Tani Indonesia/Indonesian Harmony Farmer Association), a farmer activist, an agrarian activist and one scholar from the Indonesia Institute of Science.

Out of those contacted, 9 out of 13 people responded and gave their agreement to participate in interviews (SPI, API, Director for the Centre of Food Distribution and Reserves, two senior bureaucrats from R&D of the Ministry of Agriculture, Bappenas, farmer activist, agrarian activist, and WFP) and one scholar. Unfortunately, interviews were possible with only six respondents (SPI, two senior bureaucrats from R&D of the Ministry of Agriculture, Bappenas, farmer activist, BULOG and scholar). Respondents are from various organisations representing the government (Ministry of Agriculture and Bappenas), peasant organisation (SPI) and the farmer activist. Other respondents (agrarian activist and the representative from BULOG) gave documents that were related to interview questions. The documents were the agrarian organisation’s publication for food law number 18/2012 (Adakah Jalan untuk Kedaulatan Pangan dan Pembaruan Agraria di Indonesia?, Tantangan Kedaulatan Pangan, ARC Book) and the interview between BULOG and a national business magazine relating to the role of BULOG and its efforts to achieve food security and food sovereignty (see http://www.gbgindonesia.com/en/agriculture/directory/2014/bulog_persero_/interview.php). The interviews and document resources provided sufficient information to critically answer the research questions.

**Analysis**

This research utilises discourse analysis since the research analyses definitions of food security and food sovereignty in the food law no.18/2012 and sentences from interviews. Discourse analysis relates to ‘the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people’s utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life’ (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p.1).

Discourse analysis helps to analyse interviews conducted from stakeholders that eventually have formed a pattern. Interview results with the government officials (policy makers) are moderately similar to each other, as well as interviews conducted with the representative
from the peasant organisation and the farmer activist. In addition, both sides present opposing opinions towards food security and food sovereignty issues. In this sense, discourse analysis helps to lead conclusive remarks to answer research questions.

**Problems and limitations**

Since the research was not conducted in the researcher’s home country due to limited research facilities (availability of books and other academic resources), consequently interviews were conducted via skype and telephone. Problems which appeared when conducting interviews in this way were due to the time gap, which is six hours between the UK and Indonesia. Another problem issue was technology, because of poor internet connections, interview needed to be re-scheduled. Furthermore, as this research was conducted on the planning stage of RPJMN 2015-2019 (National Medium-Term Development Planning, 2015-2019), implementation data is not available yet. In addition, policy documents related to food policy prepared by the Ministry of Agriculture are not yet finished, therefore, this research only portrays general guidance for food policy.

**Ethical issues**

Ethical considerations were applied for this research, such as the informed consent of participants was obtained, there was no pressure on individuals to participate, and respect for individual autonomy (respondents could withdraw from the study at any time even without giving a reason), care was taken to avoid causing harm, and maintain anonymity and confidentiality. The consent form was sent, however not every respondent signed and returned it, although verbal agreement to participate in the research has been given.

During the conversations, recording was needed to collect the data. Respondents were informed beforehand and have agreed to be recorded. Although, most of them asked for their responses to be kept as confidential, therefore only a sample of questions and transcription of conversation is presented in Appendice 2.
Chapter 4

The Evolving of Indonesian Food Policy

Overview of Indonesia

Indonesia is an archipelago country with over 17,000 islands, approximately 300 tribes and languages and 250 million citizens (WFP, 2012). Indonesia has the fourth largest population in the world, and one with a very diverse cultural makeup. According to a United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) report in 2013 (WFP, 2014), Indonesia is a lower Middle-Income Country (MIC) with 6.5% economic growth in 2011, the highest since 1996. Unfortunately, data from 2009 suggests that the benefit of economic growth has not been distributed equally across the country, and as a result, poverty is concentrated in six provinces (Papua, Papua Barat, Maluku, Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT), Gorontalo and Nangroe Aceh Darussalam).

The collapse of Suharto in 1998 opened the way in 1999 for Indonesia to embrace decentralisation. As such, Indonesia has adopted three main forms of decentralisation, namely political, administrative and fiscal (Green, 2005). Using the extended regions policy (kebijakan pemekaran wilayah), Indonesia has 34 provinces with more than 500 districts, and cities/municipalities (Crisis Group, 2012). To prevent tyrannical leadership, Indonesia enacted the law to limit the number of Presidential terms to two. Furthermore, Indonesia has allowed six areas of control by the central government: foreign policy, defence, security, the legal system, monetary and fiscal policy, and religious affairs. Other aspects of public policies were devolved down to primarily district and city regions, while provinces were bypassed for fear of separatist tendencies (Crisis Group). However, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) decentralisation with a rapid top-down approach has led to substantial capacity gaps in district and municipal governments along with a reduction in major spending and decreased capacity in planning, budgeting and administration, especially in the poorer and more remote regions (Crisis Group, 2012).

Indonesian institutional systems and related policies for food security

Planning and management in Indonesia have been coordinated by Bappenas, the National Development Planning Agency, through the National Long-Term and Medium-Term Development Plans (RPJPN and RPJMN) (WFP, 2014). The present long-term RPJPN covers the period 2005-2025, while the medium-term RPJMN covers the period 2015-2019.
and is entering the third phase of RPJPN. Environmental aspects have become one of the sustainable development pillars alongside economic and social aspects of the RPJM (Otoritas Jasa Keuangan, 2014). Furthermore, the main objectives of the current economic development policy are food and energy security (Otoritas Jasa Keuangan). This indicates that the Indonesian government has prioritised food security in its national development plans. The RPJMN usually converges with presidential cabinet objectives. As Indonesia has elected a new president and cabinet for the 2014-2019 period, the current RPJMN accommodates the objectives of this new leadership. The objectives have been called Nawacita and include nine goals; achieving food security is the seventh objective (Bappenas, 2015). Officially, food security has been acknowledged in national development plans and presidential decrees.

The 16 agendas to be achieved in five years include extending one million hectares of farm lands; extending one million hectares farming of dry land outside Java island; rehabilitation for three million hectares of irrigation network; market development; providing livestock transport ships; controlling land conversions; rehabilitation of polluted lands; developing 1,000 villages with seed self-sufficiency; building warehouses for facilitating the process of post harvesting in each production centre; creating agriculture banks and small medium enterprises; developing farmer skill improvement; controlling food imports; agrarian reform for nine million hectares; developing 1,000 organic farming villages; improvement of fish and salt production; and construction of new reservoirs (Bappenas, 2015.).

These objectives are to be translated into regulations and responsible institutions will be established to achieve these objectives. For example, to achieve objective 1, extending one million hectares of farm lands will be the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning, the Ministry of Forest and Environment, and the Ministry of Public Works and Housing (Bappenas, 2015). Indonesia has already established a food security agency that is coordinated by the Ministry of Agriculture. This agency created four main initiatives derived from the ‘Food Law no 18/2012’, which combined the concepts of food sovereignty and food security (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2013). However, the government has not yet clarified ways to coordinate and interlink food law, food security initiatives, Nawacita and RPJMN. According to a 2014 WFP report, the Indonesian government is characterised as fragile and lacking capacity in many areas. Its financial management and accountability structures create programme funding inflexibility and ineffective bureaucratic systems (e.g. lines of authority and process of decision making) that are difficult for outsiders to understand since
there is minimal advocacy and long-term investment is required to build relationships (WFP, 2014).

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), between 2011-2013 9.1% of the Indonesian population (approximately 23 million people) were undernourished (WFP, 2014). The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) reported that malnutrition and the stunting of growth among children under five was of major concern; at the time of the UNICEF report, Indonesia ranked fifth in the world for stunting prevalence (WFP, 2014). Another concern was increasing adult obesity, which grew from 13.9% in 2007 to 19.7% in 2013 (WFP). Priorities under RPJMN in 2010-2014 included an increase in the good health of mothers, children and infants followed by an increase in nutritional status. The government set up the five year Food and Nutrition Action Plan 2011-2015 to provide supplemental food for schoolchildren since 1997; however, these programmes received minimal government support (WFP, 2014).

Indonesia receives aid from the World Food Programme (WFP) to reduce hunger (WFP, 2014). The government of Indonesia and the WFP signed the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) (WFP, 2012). In this agreement, Indonesia has committed to share the cost of implementation on a multiyear basis (WFP). The WFP (2012) offered a ‘twin track’ strategy in order to ‘provide innovative food assistance addressing the more immediate needs of the most vulnerable groups in high priority food and nutrition insecure provinces and increasingly a nonoperational role to reach a wider population vulnerable to food insecurity’ (p.7). To help mitigate food insecurity throughout Indonesia, the Food Security and Vulnerable Atlas (FSVA) was developed. Based on the FSVA map shown below (Figure 1), food insecurity and vulnerable regions are concentrated in the eastern part of Indonesia, which includes Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT), Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB) and Papua Province (WFP, 2012).
Figure 1: Food Security and Vulnerable Atlas

Source: World Food Programme and Kementan (2010, p.xxi)
The areas in red on the FSVA map identify the highest priority areas for food security programmes and as mentioned earlier, such areas are concentrated in the eastern part of Indonesia. Food security is based on the tripartite concept: food availability, food access and food utilisation; the map was drawn up to address which regions were most vulnerable to food insecurity rather than only those already affected by food insecurity itself (World Food Programme & Kementan, 2010). Moreover, due to decentralisation implementation, the map depicts the 346 rural districts and 32 provinces that have integrated annual government plans and budgetary allocation (World Food Programme & Kementan, 2010). However, a WPF evaluation report (2014) indicated that using multi-annual funding to scale up the programmes is difficult. Further, institutional instability and unpredictable conditions within the Indonesian government hinder the country from resolving food security and malnutrition challenges. Furthermore, evolving food security in Indonesia cannot be separated from the political situation, especially politics of rice.

**Politics in food security in Indonesia**

Indonesia has experienced food security policies since the era of colonialisation, and officially adopted the term ‘food security’ after the Roma meeting in 1996 (USAID et al., 2002). Food policy in Indonesia is highly connected to politics and economic conditions (Hadiprayitno, 2010). In the Suharto era during 1980 to 1990, political stability led to high economic growth and food security (Hadiprayitno). As other Asian countries such as India and China where rice is a staple food, Indonesia seems to adhere to the idea that rice self-sufficiency means the country has achieved food security (Hadiprayitno).

Thus, food policies in Indonesia always focus on the stabilisation of rice prices. Although Indonesia has experienced various political situations, stabilisation of rice prices is always the main agenda of governments in terms of food security (Hadiprayitno, 2010). USAID et al. (2002) explained that the link between rice prices and food security is complicated, as price depends on the size of the country and the character of the market outside its borders. The link between food security and rice price does not exist in small countries, but there are often limited trade options for large countries such as China, India and Indonesia (USAID et al., 2002). Moreover, the economy and political chaos of the mid-1960s affected the rice economy. Hence, a 1967 headline from a national Indonesian newspaper read ‘rice is the barometer of the economic situation in Indonesia’ (USAID et al., 2002, p.4). Therefore, BULOG (Indonesia’s Food Logistic Agency) was established in 1967 by the government to control rice stabilisation.
As an agency established in the Suharto era, BULOG was characterised as centralised management by having the monopoly for the rice trade and massive top-down command to implement policy (Arifin, 2008). According to Arifin, with the strong leadership of Suharto and Green Revolution technology in rural areas, BULOG was noted as the successful agency to bring Indonesia to food self-sufficiency for 30 years. Moreover, Arifin continued, after the policy shifting from prioritising agriculture to the industrial sector in the mid-1980s, agriculture growth was decreasing. In addition, a period of long droughts and floods during 1997/98 caused by El Nino and EL Nina, in which severe economic crisis occurred, forced the government to import rice on a large scale. As well, in mid-1998, rice price difference between producers, retailers and consumers was the highest in the history of rice; this caused the government to spend the state budget on subsidies. This condition was made worse by the interlocking mechanism of rice import and distribution systems between government and political elites and private sectors (Arifin, 2008). Those illegal practices and non-transparent collaboration were the major aspects to loss and ineffectiveness in the national budget. The politics of rice in addition, was identified as a cause of political and social unrest in 1998 that resulted in the fall of the Suharto regime (USAID et al., 2002).

Furthermore, the collapse of Suharto in 1998 and pressure from the IMF through the government’s binding letter of intent have changed the rice trade policy by liberalisation of rice trading. Consequently, BULOG lost its monopoly of power. Liberalisation in the rice trade promoted by the IMF was accused as major causes of failure in rice production and the distribution system, since liberalisation was not complemented by strengthening of the economic institution for the rice market and food policy implementation (Arifin, 2008).

The significant role of things related to rice in a country such as Indonesia is acknowledged by Timmer (2004) who postulated that ‘food security for a country involves two basic dimensions: stable market supplies and prices for the staple food – rice in Asia, and reliable access by all households to supplies in these markets (or from home production)’ (as cited in USAID et al., 2002 p.1). In this sense, food security should achieve macro aspects for price stability, and secondly is a micro aspect that is the ability to purchase the rice. Food security issues may increase innate national tensions, which are exacerbated by the requirement to decentralise government policies and programmes and are affected by decisions about resource provisions (USAID et al., 2002).

Furthermore, Timmer (2004) postulates, to achieve food security, a country, particularly an Asian country in which the staple food is rice, should pay proper attention to rapid economic growth and rice price stability. Additionally, food security connects to political
stability, which becomes an important influence on investment, including foreign direct investment and the portfolio investments within the country (USAID et al., 2002). USAID et al. (2002) further indicated that the Indonesian government and other developing countries have programmes to empower poor and vulnerable households to access food. However, there is a lack of policies and programmes at the macro level. In a review of agricultural policies in Indonesia, the OECD (2012) highlighted foreign direct investment for agriculture in addition to revamping land reform and agricultural policy, improving infrastructure facilities, and encouraging trades, as examples of macro level changes.

Timmer (2004) argued that the Indonesian government is misplaced to articulate food security with the self-sufficient and restrict food import and free trade. Both recommendations from USAID and OECD seem to also suggest what Jarosz and other scholars indicated, that food security proposes technocratic and developmentalist ideas (Jarosz, 2014). Interestingly, the Indonesian government has continued food programmes that stress self-sufficiency. However, Hadiprayitno (2010) argues that although the Indonesian government initiated food programmes for vulnerable people, food policy is ‘the structural non-fulfilment of the economic social and cultural right of the poor’ (pp.126-127). She points out that Indonesian political consideration and macro-economic concerns had not paid sufficient attention to the interests of the poor. Additionally, the competitive and oligarchic food market model in Indonesia often governs more than government control. She concludes that an attempt to stabilise rice prices has been led by demands to satisfy macroeconomics or to maintain political stability, instead of securing human rights, entitlements, or fulfilling a government’s obligations to poor and vulnerable people.

**Food security policy in the decentralisation era**

By embracing decentralisation, Indonesia has to fulfil three main goals: political, administrative, and fiscal decentralisation (Green, 2005). Regarding food security, decentralisation of pricing occurs through the authority given to regency (kabupaten) (USAID et al., 2002). USAID suggests that decentralisation brings hope to sustain food security in the long term since it creates opportunities for more effective management of programmes to alleviate poverty and foster local human capital (USAID et al., 2002). Nonetheless, managing food security through decentralisation requires rigorous coordination between central governments and the authorities in provinces and lower levels of government (region/city).
The politics of decentralisation may create more borders that create ‘fragmented’ economies, generating vastly different price in every region (Timmer, 2004). Additionally, the first challenge faced by governments includes the tension between free trade and border control to protect regions from any outside instability that may arise (USAID et al., 2002). The second challenge involves the tension between local versus central action (USAID et al.). The third challenge is the fragile, ineffective bureaucratic system and lack of capacity of the Indonesian government in many areas, especially in remote and poor regions (WFP, 2014) that creates gaps in implementing top down programmes and a lack of bottom up initiatives.

**New approach of food security**

Regardless of the recommendations from international bodies, the Indonesian government enacted a new food law, number 18/2012, which put self-sufficiency as part of a framework together with food sovereignty and food security. Food law number 18/2012 is a revised version of food law number 7/1996. The Indonesian government defines food security, food sovereignty and food self-sufficiency as follows:

- **Food sovereignty** is the right of the state/nation to determine its own food policy, which secure “the right for food” for its people and provide the right of the community to determine their own food system based on local resource potential.
- **Food Resilience** is the ability of the state/nation to produce diversified food domestically to fulfil enough food for all people through the optimal use of natural resource, human resource, social and economic potential, and local wisdom, with dignity.
- **Food Security** is a state of condition that food is fulfilled and accessible for all people, from macro level country) to individual, in terms of its quantity, quality, safety, nutrition, equitable/evenly distribute, affordable, diversity, halal/ comply with belief and culture, to have a healthy, active, and sustainable productive life. (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2013, p. 19)

To bring food law number 18/2012 into practice, the government established an Agency for Food Security and decentralised its institution at the provincial and city levels. The initiatives proposed by the Agency for Food Security include:

1. Development of sustainable homes – yard food gardens
2. Development of food resilient villages
3. Strengthening of community of food distribution institutions
4. Development of community food reserve (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2013, p.21-25)
The Agency for Food Security claimed that these initiatives had started in 2009 and results met with the objectives. The Agency for Food Security has partnered with several international bodies to tackle food insecurity (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2013). One partner, the WFP has produced a food security and vulnerability atlas; there has been no further explanation whether these initiatives were based on the atlas. Also, there has been little evidence to connect Agency for Food Security initiatives with other food security programmes.

In this sense, food security in Indonesia has complex dimensions that are institutional and cultural in nature. As discussed earlier, food security is a main objective of the RPJMN 2015-2019. Further, the Nawacita of the Presidential Cabinet 2014-2019 made food security an important element for the Indonesian government. However, the fragmented institutional system e.g. how the food security agency will coordinate with other ministries has not been discussed yet. It may become more problematic as Indonesia adopts decentralisation and must coordinate with vertical tiers of governmental institutions (national-provincial-regional-municipality-village).

Additionally, there are other main actors in food security beside the government that include civil society groups, farmers and agri-business companies. Peasant organisations, or unions as they usually called themselves, have a long history in Indonesia’s politics and food security. Peasant organisations have been main actors of the social movement in Indonesia for decades (Bachriadi, 2012). As a country which has large agrarian economies, disputes over lands, seeds, fertilizer and rice prices are clearly visible. Moreover, the role of peasant organisations in shaping Indonesia’s politics and especially food policy are inevitable. Therefore, discussing peasant organisations’ roles will obtain understanding of how the government perceives and deals with them and vice versa.

**Freedom of speech and peasant organisation’s development in Indonesia**

Freedom of speech has blossomed after the collapse of the Suharto era as indicated by increasing media and civil societies (Idea, n.d.). Since the colonial era, peasant organisations have played a role in food issues, although in every era, their forms and roles have been different. Peasants in Indonesia have had a long history in the colonial era. Wolf (1957) defined peasant organisations in Central Java as a closed corporate community. Peasants are defined by Wolf as agricultural producers who utilise their land for livelihood and not for business or profit. This closed corporate community is exclusive and prevents outsiders from becoming members.
Characteristics of corporate communities changed when Indonesia was governed by Soekarno, at which time peasants were affiliated with the communist party, then categorised as a progressive revolutionary group (Rahmawati, 2003). The Leader of the Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI/Indonesian Communist Party, with ‘left’ ideology) DN Aidit, in the Soekarno era (1950s), believed that agrarian revolution is the soul of the ‘democratic revolution’ in Indonesia (Bachriadi, 2012). This idea moved the PKI to build a considerable amount of power in rural areas and called for land reform using the slogan ‘land to the peasant’ (Bachriadi, 2012, para 1). Not too long after the calling, the Barisan Tani Indonesia (BTI/Indonesian Peasant Front) affiliated with PKI had successfully attracted poor farmers and poor villagers to join this party (Bachriadi, 2012; Umwaelzung, 2011). In 1955, BTI claimed it had a 3 million membership and PKI was able to become the big fourth party in the general election (Bachriadi, 2012).

In 1960 when the new share-tenancy law and agrarian law were enacted, PKI and BTI had the opportunity to gain massive mobilisation in rural areas and gave them a legal basis to demand fairer shares of crops produced between tenant farmers and landowners (the demand was for a 60:40 ratio in favour of tenants instead of the existing share of a 20:80 ratio in favour of landowners) (Bachriadi, 2012). However, landowners and their allies refused the demands and it fuelled radical actions by the PKI and BTI to occupy lands for poor farmers. This action was believed to be a background of the anti-communist massacre in 1965-66 marking the collapse of Soekarno and brought Suharto to power (Bachriadi). The dictatorship model in the Suharto era had officially ended the mass-based rural movement.

A New Order (identified as the Suharto era) established a single organisation for peasants that operated under state control, called the Himpunan Kerukunan Tani Indonesia (Indonesian Farmer Harmony Organisation) (Rahmawati, 2003); however, this organisation is not appropriately called a civil society (Idea, n.d.). Umwaelzung (2011) noted that ‘green revolution’ programmes backed by the World Bank were run extensively under the Suharto regime. The state plantations started to grab peasants’ lands, particularly lands owned by ‘communist’ peasants (Umwaelzung). The absence of freedom of speech and absence of independent peasant organisations and the government’s repressive approach had prevented people from protesting against land evictions (Bachriadi, 2012). However, in the 1990s, youth activists with leftist political ideology tried to revive the rural movement through transforming the local peasants’ struggles against land loss into independent local peasant organisations (Bachriadi). Eventually, Serikat Petani Jawa Barat (SPJB/The West Java
Peasant’s Union) was established as the first autonomous peasant organisation in the authoritarian era. This union was an alliance between local peasant leaders and urban-based activists in land conflict areas. Afterwards, several peasant organisations were formed in other regions such as Serikat Petani Lampung (PITL, the Lampung Peasant Union), Serikat Petani Mandiri Jawa Tengah (SPMJT/the Independent Peasant Union of Central Java) and Serikat Petani Sumatra Utara (SPSU/the North Sumatra Peasant Union) (Bachriadi, 2012). These local peasant organisations were the embryo of the national peasant organisation, Serikat Petani Indonesian (SPI/Indonesian Peasant Union). SPSU activists launched the SPI a few weeks after the collapse of Suharto in 1998 and they claim a national presence (Bachriadi).

SPI has been described as a national peasant organisation linked with the international peasant movement La Via Campesina. La Via Campesina itself is an international peasant organisation that has members in 73 countries from Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas. They believe that the promotion of small-scale sustainable agriculture is a way to promote social justice and dignity (Viacampesina, n.d.). Furthermore, La Via Campesina is well known as the main actor in advocating the food sovereignty narrative. They argue that food sovereignty will ‘ensure that the rights to use and manage lands, territories, water, seeds, livestock and biodiversity are in the hands of those who produce food and not of the corporate sector’ (Viacampesina, n.d., para.9). Echoing the La Via Campesina campaign in promoting peasants and small-scale farmers as main actors in the delivery of food sovereignty, SPI has actively criticised the government’s policies related to food and agrarian law.

Other peasant organisations were formed within a few years after the establishment of the SPI. The Aliansi Petani Indonesia (API/Indonesian Farmers Alliance) is another peasant organisation with a similar ideology to the SPI and La Via Campesina. The Aliansi Gerakan Reformasi Agraria (AGRA/Alliance of Movement for Agrarian Reform) and PETANI Mandiri (Self-Reliant Indonesian Peasant and Fisherfolks’ Movement) (Bachriadi, 2012) are other autonomous peasant and agrarian unions. These peasant-agriculture based movements are believed to be bringing radical social change in Indonesia.

Roles of peasant organisations in the politics of Indonesia

The collapse of the Suharto regime that weakened state and military power had triggered many peasant groups to take over vacant land throughout Indonesia (Bachriadi, 2012). They occupied the vacant state land – state forest lands or plantation lands used by
companies – although most of the groups said that they were reclaiming their lands that had previously been grabbed years before. By occupying some lands, many local peasant organisations became more powerful, an example is the Serikat Petani Bengkulu (STB/Bengkulu Peasant Union) which was able to attract about 25 thousand peasant households and control around 30 thousand hectares of lands (Bachriadi).

In 1999, when Indonesia started to embrace the decentralisation politics that brought democratisation into local levels, local peasant organisations were pushed into participating in local politics. Moreover, having new power to mobilise the masses from grassroots has attracted local elites to take into account peasants’ potency to escalate their votes. Accordingly, backup from an election winner is a promising way to secure the peasants’ lands (Bachriadi, 2012). Consequently, many leaders of local peasant organisations became ‘brokers’ selling voters to the local politicians. In some cases, this engagement brings positive impacts for peasant organisations as the elected mayor promises to give them access to the local budget and policy making. However, the political contract between politicians and peasant organisations to some extent has led to internal destruction for peasant organisations as disputes among activists and members happened frequently (Bachriadi, 2012). In this sense, local peasant organisations from one region to another may affiliate with different political parties. In contrast, national peasant organisations such as the SPI and API have declared themselves as free from any political alliance. There is little evidence to understand how the control mechanism of the SPI and API devolves to its branches at local levels. Accordingly, local peasant organisations discussed by Bachriadi have no further explanation whether they are branches of national peasant organisations or independent local peasant organisations. This remain questionable as it is unlikely that a local organisation has no connection to the national level and if the local organisation is a branch of a national organisation, it is also unlikely to have the freedom to make independent decisions, particularly relating to significant matters such as deciding to which political party it will be affiliated.

**Peasant organisation in food security**

As aforementioned, food security has become a national agenda that is officially documented in RPJMN and also the president’s objectives, the Nawacita. The Agency for Food Security mentioned that to institute food security initiatives, governments have coordinated with other ministries, private companies, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (Ministry of Agriculture Republic of Indonesia, 2013). However, the Agency for Food Security Agency has not explained the mechanism of coordination (e.g. cost or other sharing
responsibilities) with NGOs or NGO positions on food security. Governments have only mentioned that they have partnered with NGOs without specifying which NGOs have collaborated with governments, particularly; in the national planning documents, peasant organisations are hardly mentioned. In this sense, the Indonesian government is still an impediment to partnership with peasant organisations.
Chapter 5

Findings and Discussion

Interpretation of food security and food sovereignty by different actors

**Human right to food for Indonesia context**

This chapter provides an overview of research findings as related to each research question. As mentioned previously, Indonesia has experienced food security since the colonial era (Timmer, 2004). Post-independence, food was identified as an integral component of human rights in the 1945 constitution (interview with representative from Bappenas – interviewee 1, May 2015). Article 28C verse 1 of the 4th amendment of the 1945 constitution indicated that ‘every person has the right to develop themselves through fulfilment of basic needs….’ (interviewee 1). While the word ‘food’ is not mentioned explicitly, food is well associated with ‘basic needs’ in the amendment. Furthermore, Indonesia enacted the Human Rights Law No 39 in 1999, which provides the definition of human rights as follows:

> A set of rights bestowed by God Almighty in the essence and being of humans as creations of God which must be respected, held in the highest esteem and protected by the state, law, government and all people in order to protect human dignity and worth. (as cited in Hadiprayitno, 2010, p. 125)

Within the Human Rights Law, the right to food is not explicitly addressed; however, according to Hadiprayitno (2010) in article 9, ‘everyone has the right to life, to sustain life, and to improve his or her standard of living’, which included the right to food (Hadiprayitno). However, the law of human rights jurisdiction regarding violation only covers crimes against humanity such as torture and genocide; violations related to freedom of speech and right to food have not been assured (Hadiprayitno).

Interestingly, policy maker respondents (interviewee 1/Bappenas and interviewees 2 and 3/representatives from Ministry of Agriculture) argue that the government has entitled human rights, particularly food security. The policy makers perceive that article 28C in the 1945 constitutional amendment is enough to justify that the Indonesian government has made the right to food equal to other human right issues such as humanity. In contrast, the farmer activist (interviewee 4) and peasant organisation respondent (interviewee 5/SPI) offered criticism, stating that the government only placed attention on the technical aspects of the right to food, such as affordable food prices and the small number of imports.
Similarly, La Via Campesina’s scholar, Claeys (2013) offered an interesting point of view about human rights framed in terms of food. Claeys argued that contemporary human rights regimes are constrained by present social movements:

First, contemporary human rights are dominated by western, liberal and individualist conception of rights. Second, these regimes are built around the obligations of states and fail to adequately address the human rights responsibilities of private and transnational actors. Third, human rights emphasise economic liberty – understood as individual appropriation of, access to and control over economic resources – at the expense of equality of outcome/welfare. (Claeys, 2013, p.2)

La Via Campesina offered a new human right: ‘human right to food sovereignty has not been claimed as an individual right, but rather as the right of communities, states, peoples and regions’ (Claeys, 2013, p.3). Compared to the La Via Campesina definition of human rights to food sovereignty, the Indonesian government’s definition of the right to food sounds inadequate, since the government uses the term food sovereignty as one pillar in food policy. According to Hadiprayitno (2010), Indonesia adopted the human rights definition enumerated in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). If this information is correct, human rights as defined by the Indonesian government could be identified as Claeys (2013) suggested: human rights regimes that are a restraint to the social movement.

**Interpretation of integrating food sovereignty into food law number 18/2012**

Food law number 18/2012 underlies every food policy in Indonesia. The law itself is claimed as having a better approach to cope with food problems: ‘the food law number 18/2012 provides more detailed aspects in term of involvement of society in providing food, affordability of food, information systems and research and development related to food’ (interviewee 1). Peasant organisations acknowledge that food law number 18/2012 has attempted to insert a new paradigm in approaching food: food sovereignty. Whereas the farmer activist (interviewee 4) presents a sceptical view that in the era of President Yudhoyono, the government was likely to accommodate all ideas related to food issues although they were often incoherent or even contrary to one another. To some extent, peasant organisations feel relief because of the insertion of food sovereignty into food law is a sign that the government has paid attention to the notion of food sovereignty. However, when the concept of food security and food sovereignty are brought together into food law, they tend to clash. Peasant organisations and farmer activists perceive food security and food sovereignty as opposite notions; therefore, reconciliation between them is impossible.

Food security and food sovereignty will not be able to be united, since in practice reconciliation between corporates and small farmers as well as conventional
agriculture and the agroecology method is found to be difficult … some parties, particularly high officials in the Ministry of Agriculture still perceive food sovereignty is against imports that means Indonesia isolates herself from international trade. (Interviewee 4, 2015)

Furthermore, peasant organisations and human right activists appealed the judicial review of food law number 18/2012. They argued that food law number 18/2012 was no different than its predecessor, food law no 7/1996, which gave more priority to corporations rather than small farmers as food producers. In contrast, policy makers believed both concepts were intertwined and complementary to each other, as the representative from Bappenas commented:

Food sovereignty is the right of the nation to decide its own food policy then be able to ensure the right to food to every person and in order to achieve food sovereignty, the government should achieve food security and food resiliency. (Interviewee 1, May, 2015)

There are two interesting points. The first is the definition of food sovereignty and food security by the Indonesian government that was presented in the previous chapter and the second is the interpretation of the Indonesian government regarding the relationship between food security and food sovereignty. Bachriadi (2014) noted that food sovereignty defined by food law number 18/2012 is the right of a nation to decide its own food policy, whereas food security is defined as the regularity of food provision. In this sense, food security and food sovereignty as defined by the Indonesian government are completely different from what is defined in international food sovereignty discourse. Furthermore, Bachriadi argued that food law number 18/2012 is more about the regulation of food management in terms of food affordability, an aspect that has been greatly criticised by food sovereignty proponents. It means that food security and food sovereignty as defined by the Indonesian government are not referred to in the food sovereignty and food security narrative (the definition of food security and food sovereignty is presented in chapter 2).

Furthermore, the Indonesian government’s interpretation of the relationship between food security and food sovereignty seems opposite to what Patel postulated (2009, p.66): ‘food sovereignty is a foil to the prevailing notions of food security’ or a ‘precondition to genuine food security’. In this sense, the Indonesian government can be perceived as using jargon rather than understanding of how to use the notions as law. Jarosz (2014) claimed that the concept of food sovereignty might be different in every country. For instance, in the United States food sovereignty is interpreted as food justice, focusing on restructuring food systems by changing racial hierarchy and class divisions. In France, food sovereignty is more an alliance between regional forms of production and regional food origins.
Furthermore, food sovereignty in Canada refers to the restructuring of food systems by constructing a national food policy which highlights strengthening indigenous food sovereignty, providing school meals provisioned by local farmers, and encouraging plurality (Jarosz, 2014). SPI (2014) offers that the food sovereignty movement in Indonesia should focus on eradicating poverty and rural development with the emphasis on agrarian reform. This is essentially congruent with the government’s objectives in RPJMN 2015-2019. However, by using the government’s definition of food sovereignty, the approach used to achieve these goals is different with the SPI.

Based on the interview with Purwanto, a scholar and researcher at the Indonesian Institute of Science who studies food policy and rural development, the Indonesian government tends to generalise the terms food security, food sovereignty, and food resiliency with less consideration of their definitions in global discourses. Echoing the farmer activist’s opinion that the government under President Yudhoyono was likely to accommodate every single notion, Purwanto argues that the wish to accommodate all notions is understandable since it is perceived as a government attempt to build a food security system.

**Is Food Law number 18/2012 providing concerted and systemic approach to food?**

Regarding the definition of food sovereignty by the Indonesian government that Bachriadi (2014) argued was all about food management, Purwanto believes that putting food sovereignty terms into food law number 18/2012 has forced the government to change its policies. If the previous food law (number 7/1996) has only defined food security, which implies as long as people get food to avoid hunger without considering food provenance, then food security is achieved. Yet, by inserting food sovereignty in the new food law, the government has started to consider food provenance and the diversity of food, as Indonesia has a rich food culture and also import limitation. Additionally, Purwanto notes that the food system in Indonesia has clearly needed repair. The long chain of the rice trade that harms small farmers, and land disputes over agriculture, rice and other staple food imports, continue to be problems that the government needs to address, along with the issue of promoting the diversity of local food. Using food sovereignty as one pillar of food philosophy is seen by Purwanto as a good intention by the government to try a new method to fix a broken food system, regardless of the original definition of food sovereignty. With food sovereignty included in the law, the government declares the right to decide its own food policy and consequently, the government has to review food policy or programmes offered by international bodies (such the FAO, IMF or World Bank) to determine whether
they are coherent with national policies or not contradictory with Indonesian culture. Purwanto perceives integrating both concepts is fine as long as the government commits to fulfil the mandate of food law. Meanwhile, there is little concrete evidence that the food sovereignty framework has changed government policies. Indeed, the government has regulated the restriction of imports for fruit, vegetable and animal products (Donnan, 2015), however, it is difficult to analyse whether this regulation is based on the commitment to fulfil the mandate of food law or merely political action to win public support.

Government motivation in defining food sovereignty that deviates from the original context is still unknown. This could be simply due to lack of knowledge on the part of the government or this act is deliberate, since the government wants to adopt the input of all groups of society, but also would not wish conflict with corporations. Then, it could be argued that the government took a middle path of defining food sovereignty in accordance with the will of the government. If so, the government recognises that to implement the ‘origin’ narrative of food sovereignty has the potential to move away from or even be contrary to neo-liberalism and capitalism. As since the Suharto era, Indonesia tended to use the approaches of neo-liberalism and capitalism in politics, if the government is using the original context of food sovereignty, they could be seen to follow radical notions that are more inclined towards leftist ideology.

Considering the government approach that prefers to seek ‘safe’ ways in formulating policies by intending to win public support but also do not want to lose support from corporations, the research findings therefore conclude, first, the government will never adopt ‘original’ food sovereignty narrative into law or other regulations. Unless, perhaps when the government agreed to implement the GFS, it indirectly implemented the food sovereignty principles. Second, reconciliation between food sovereignty into food security is unlikely to occur, since there is a minimal willingness from the government to build environments for food sovereignty.

Nevertheless, there is the potential to produce a concerted and systemic approach to food by integrating food sovereignty into food security. This view is upheld by interviewees 1, 2 and 3 (interviewee 3 being the senior researcher in the Ministry of Agriculture). They argue that the new food law number 18/2012 brings more space/opportunity for central government and local government in building a sustainability food system.

This integration is claimed by policy makers to bring new approaches to food, although according to the SPI (interviewee 5), the government still performs business as usual. If we look to the Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional, known as the Indonesian
National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2015-2019 for food and agriculture, the following claims are made:

- Improvement of food affordability through strengthening of domestic products, i.e. improvement of paddy production, improvement of side food, such as sugar and meat, improvement of fish production, improvement of irrigation system
- Improvement in food distribution quality and people accessibility to food
- Improvement over consumption of quality and nutritious food
- Mitigate of food insecurity potential
- Livelihood increasing for main food actors (farmers)

(interview with representative from Bappenas – interviewee 1, May 2015)

The government again stated that these policies encourage innovative approaches in implementation. In this regard, the government gives attention to research and development for agriculture in order to provide good quality seeds, fertilizers and also develop technologies for agriculture. In addition, the government attempts to create conducive environments (facilitate investment policies, cutting long bureaucratic processes for investors and so on) to attract more investors for the agricultural sector. Moreover, an interview with the BULOG chairman Alimoesa that was conducted by the magazine Global Business Guide Indonesia (2014), found that to achieve food security and food sovereignty, BULOG provided assistance for farmers, i.e. financial aid to purchase new agricultural technology and good quality seeds and fertilizers. BULOG also agreed to buy the farmers’ products, yet BULOG did not explain further whether it would buy rice from all farmers, and what mechanism it would use to buy.

The SPI and the farmer activist argue that nothing has changed from the approach used by government towards food, despite having integrated food sovereignty in food law. The government’s approach to food remains as business as usual, which leads to technocratic and developmentalist methods. For example, research to get good quality seeds (defined by having more resistance to pests and being able to produce more than normal seeds) is eventually developing GMO seeds (see Agrofarm, 2014) and were opposed by food sovereignty advocates. Correspondingly, in order to get as much as possible for rice production, the government tends to open new lands for monocultural purposes. In the end, the government seek investors to buy such lands. Indeed, the government encourages family farming with agroecology methods, yet has not seen it as a potential solution to address food insecurity. The government still stands on the assumption that effective ways
to achieve food security are to generate GMO seeds, encourage high technology for agriculture and have large-scale production produced by large-scale farming.

Furthermore, the way in which the government is implementing the policies is still to prioritise other governmental agencies in both horizontal and vertical tiers. In addition, by embracing a decentralised system, the roles of local government in the success of policies and programmes are enormous. It is undeniable that every region has different capacities regarding human capital, finance and good governance levels. According to the farmer activist (interviewee 4), local bureaucrats have very little understanding of food policy, especially as related to such concepts as food sovereignty and food security. Additionally, decentralisation has not yet been reported as successfully bringing good governance as the current estimated indication is that approximately 70% (318 of 512) of mayors/bupatis are suspected of corruption (see JPNN, 2014). Not surprisingly, farmer activists, peasant organisations, and agrarian activists are pessimistic about government policies.

Furthermore, in order to produce more innovative approaches to food, governments seek partnership with private companies. As explicitly shown at the Jakarta Food Security Summit held in February 2015, when announcement was made of government partnerships with KADIN (Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry) to invest in agribusiness and to develop technology and innovation in GMOs to boost agricultural production while also giving credit to farmers (Hardiyan, 2015). The government may assume that partnership with CSOs, especially peasant organisations, is scarcely beneficial to achieve food security. It might be due to the nature of Indonesia as young democratic country (17 years) still trying to find its way to accommodate and enter into partnership with groups that in previous times were non-existent or even banned, such as peasant organisations for instance. Nevertheless, Indonesia has enacted several acts to ensure freedom of speech and also civil society engagement in policy.

**Space in Indonesian policy framework for farmers, peasant organisations and customers**

In general, Indonesia has created a policy framework for ensuring bottom up aspirations and needs through the Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan (Musrenbang/Development Planning Forum). Musrenbang is ruled under Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (National Development Planning System) law number 25/2004 (Djohani, 2008). Musrenbang is held from the lowest level of government to the highest desa/kelurahan/village – district – municipality/region – province – national. In
this Musrenbang forum, every citizen has the right to comment on drafting policy or to convey their aspirations. Although, Musrenbang is frequently only a ceremonial part to drafting the RKP and not representing the citizen’s aspiration (Djohani).

Furthermore, specific to farmers, the government has enacted the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers law number 19/2013. Syahyuti, Wahyuni, Suhaeti, and Zakaria, (2014) further explain, in this law, farmers ‘have to’ join in farmer groups, called Gabungan Kelompok Tani (Gapoktan/Farmer Group) or Kelompok Tani Nelayan Andalan (KTNA/Farmer and Fisherman Group). The government only assists and supports farmers who join in the Gapoktan and KTNA, since those two groups were established by the government. Those organisations called patronage-type interest groups flourished under the New Order (Antlov & Wetteberg, 2011). Since the Reformation era (1998 onward), other farmer groups (the SPI and API) have been established (as discussed in chapter 4), however, the government seems reluctant to acknowledge them as entities to represent farmers. This is proven in Law number 19/2013, both the SPI and API were not mentioned as one of the farmer groups that receive benefits from the government. The SPI representative commented during his interview:

‘Only those two farmer organisations (HKTI and KTNA) that were established by New Order in the Suharto era can access municipality also national funding to big projects such as Pekan Tani National (National Farmers Week) event every year.’ (Interviewee 5, April 2015)

After the judicial review was appealed by the SPI, Mahkamah Konstitusi (MK/Constitutional Court) it was stated that the SPI together with Gopaktan and KTNA are official organisations to receive assistance and support from the government (interviewee 5, 2015). Furthermore, the SPI representative noted that besides receiving benefits, peasant and farmer organisations also have the right to be involved in the policy making process:

Although the government has acknowledged the existence of peasant organisations (the protection and empowerment law, no. 19/2013), yet peasant organisations’ influence in food policy is very limited. In other words, this can be called as a formality on behalf of civil society participation. Another participation form is the discussion forum regarding the drafting of Permentan (Ministry of Agriculture Decree); however it is also far from significant as it is only in final draft. (Interviewee 5, April 2015)

During the interview with Purwanto, he argued that Gapoktan is more representative of farmers’ needs and aspirations than peasant organisations such as the SPI or API. He speculated that peasant organisations’ members might not be representing the peasant, but activists that are concerned about peasant’s/farmer’s issues who have advocacy skills to
lobby the government. Echoing Purwanto’s argument, Antlov and Wetteberg (2014) stated that:

Civil society activists in Indonesia have been characterized as ‘floating democrats’ that hover above but are not connected to Indonesian society and thus they are unable to gain popular legitimacy and are incapable of mustering a broad base sufficient to mobilize political support or influence (p.3)

Yet, the SPI claims that at the basic level, the SPI is the peasants/farmers. Agreeing with the SPI, the farmer activist argues that: ‘Indonesian government perception in general towards peasant organisations such as SPI and API is still negative’ (interviewee 4, April, 2015).

The policy maker from the Ministry of Agriculture believes that the government has good relations with any peasant/farmer organisation without distinguishing them from one another (interviewee 2, May 2015). Some improvements have been shown by the government to allow peasant organisation involvement in policy making and implementation (interviewee 2), yet no data is available to support this statement, although data of CSOs engagement in general has increased during five years (2005-2009) as shown below in Figure 2:

![Forms of CSO engagement, 2005-2009](source: Antlov and Wetteberg (2011))

Figure 2: Forms of CSO engagement, 2005-2009

Source: Antlov and Wetteberg (2011)
However, from the point of view of the SPI and peasant activist, the government still favours Gapoktan, KHTI and KTNA over other peasant organisations. This can be due to two reasons, according to government psychology. The government tends to trust civil society organisations established by them and just because those organisations get funding regularly from the government, they are less critical of them than independent civil society organisations (CSOs). For example, according to Bachriadi (2014), when the rice price goes up, peasant organisations with other CSOs usually do street protests against the government, while organisations such as Gapoktan and KHTI never explicitly criticise government policies. Second, as discussed in chapter 4, the SPI is likely considered to be a radical leftist organisation that is “too active” in criticising the government’s policies.

Regarding consumers, the Indonesian government has enacted the Protection of Consumers Law no.9/1999 which includes protection from harmful food. However, this law does not regulate consumers’ rights in policy involvement. Hence, producers and consumers of food seem to be separate entities. Farmers and their organisations focus on their own issues that are likely to be completely separate from the consumers’ issues. Direct interactions between producers and consumers are likely to happen in actual transactions but there is an absent mechanism to bring these food main actors together in order to engage in government policies.

**Food sovereignty and political circumstance in Indonesia.**

Additionally, food sovereignty became one of the main campaign platforms of elected President Joko Widodo (Jokowi) in 2014. President Widodo said in his campaign:

> Food security is different from food sovereignty. Food security is simply the availability of foodstuffs (logistically) in warehouses and in the markets regardless of the origin whether from import or from locally produced. Food sovereignty means we produce and market our foodstuffs ourselves, while the surplus of agricultural crops is exported. If we are sovereign in our food production, any disturbance abroad will not have a significant impact on our food reserve and we can still have adequate supply to feed our people. Our food sovereignty vision at the highest level is for our food production to overflow the local and international markets or at the very least, we have to be the largest food producers in ASEAN. (as cited in Lassa & Shrestha, 2014, para.1-2)

Based on this statement, food sovereignty became one bullet point in Nawacita (nine national priorities). However, in an interview with the farmer activist, he argues that the food sovereignty motivation in the president’s campaign was degraded in Nawacita, and disappeared from the RPJMN 2015-2019. According to Lassa and Shrestha (2014), food sovereignty was politically attractive to nationalistic regimes (such as Bolivia), and can be used to attract voters particularly for countries with large agrarian economies. As discussed
in chapter 4, peasant organisations at the local level have the potential to become a ‘vote broker’ in democratic markets, as the candidates try to win the hearts and minds of the voters by giving promises to get benefits from the elected mayor’s programmes. Of course it is too early to judge the first six months of President Jokowi’s regime; yet, according to the farmer activist, by looking into RPJMN 2015-2019, which does not adequately reflect the food sovereignty framework, President Jokowi’s statement can be perceived only to attract farmers/labour voters who have significant numbers in Indonesia.

Relation between Indonesia food policy and global food policy

Furthermore, the narrative for food security governance places great importance on the engagement of CSOs through Civil Society Mechanisms (CSMs). This is emphasised by the UN High-Level Panel of Experts in their formulation of the Global Strategic Framework (GSF) for Food Security and Nutrition (McKeon, 2015). The UN enacted Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) after the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); the second SDG includes a provision to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture. According to the United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition (UNSCN) (2015) both GSF and SDG 2 processes are intertwined with regard to sustainable food systems and nutrition. The Second International Conference for Nutrition (ICN2) that was hosted by the FAO and WHO focused on sustainable food systems as a bridge between agriculture and health that adopts the third version of the GSF document. However, according to Andrea Ferrante, a committee member of the European Coordination La Via Campesina and of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), the ICN2 is only for intergovernmental representatives and has not been opened to all civil society organisations (Society for International Development, 2014). With the focus on discussing Principles for Responsible Agriculture Investment (RAI), ICN2 was attended by transnational agribusiness and food corporations such as Syngenta, Monsanto, DuPont and Nestle. Ferrante argued that having partnerships with companies that do not support agroecology and instead promote the loss of agro-biodiversity and unwholesome food fortification is far from the food sovereignty narrative. Further, Ferrante worried that initiatives resulting from ICN2 are driven by corporate sectors and its interests. In this sense, food security governance at a global level still faces challenges.

Looking at the national level with the Indonesian case, as Indonesia is a country that has a legally binding agreement to the UN programmes and to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to achieve SDG 2, some initiatives have been incorporated into RPJMN 2015-2019:
For SD goal 2, we have formulated targets to reduce hunger by improving food consumption quality to reach score of Pola Pangan Harapan (PPH/Food Pattern Expectation) of 92.5 in 2019 and improvement of food security and nutrition through several programmes. (Interviewee 1, May 2015)

Additionally, in achieving these goals, stakeholders of the government are ministries designed for varying purposes:

To achieve these goals we have partnership with ministries such as the ministry of agriculture, ministry of public work, ministry of environment, ministry of agrarian, ministry of maritime and fishery, ministry of small medium enterprises, ministry of koperasi, Indonesian Bank and local government (Pemda). (Interviewee 1, May 2015)

Reflecting on global food security governance, changing practices for food security will affect Indonesia to some extent. Olivier De Schutter, Special Rapporteur on the right to food (United Nation General Assembly, 2014), stated that to reduce hunger and malnutrition the government should not continue business as usual and should improve coordination across sectors, across time, across levels of governance and also empower communities at the local level. As mentioned previously, the intergovernmental organisation, the UN, has legally binding agreements with country members, therefore, the binding agreement towards the governing of food security will likely influence Indonesia to formulate policy and ways to implement it. The GSF documents have brought fresh air to the governance of food security, especially for food sovereignty advocates. Yet, bringing corporations to invest in agricultural sectors in the ICN2 agenda, gives the Indonesian government legitimate ways of attracting much investment for agriculture, while again neglecting the development of small-scale farming.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

Conclusions on findings and discussion

This research aimed to observe and analyse the integration of a food sovereignty framework into Indonesian food security policy. Integrating the two concepts is believed to be an important step in Indonesian food policy yet it is still premature to interpret the food sovereignty narrative in practice. Analysing food law number 18/2012 by using the fundamental concept of the food sovereignty narrative reveals the human right to food and that the government is responsible to ensure its achievement.

There were the following research findings: Indonesia has ensured the fulfilment of basic needs, which includes food and protects that fulfilment by law. Right to food is also ensured in human rights law by the government yet it is not explicitly mentioned. Lack of a definition of human rights to food might cause hesitation by the government in approaching food issues. This can be seen by the way in which the government approaches defining the food sovereignty narrative in the food law. Due to a lack of a strong philosophical foundation in approaching food issues, the government has reduced the meaning of food sovereignty to food management as strengthening the right of a nation to decide their own food policy (Bachriadi, 2014). It leads to a conclusion that analysing whether food sovereignty and food security can be reconciled is not necessary since the definitions of both are based on one topic area: food management. However, academics argue that both definitions are slightly different; food sovereignty matters as a component of food provenance, while food security does not. Hence, by adding the food sovereignty narrative, the government has a legal foundation to reduce imports, improve local food, and promote diversity of food. The government perceived food sovereignty and food security as complementary, whereas academics perceived this integration as a proper attempt for a more concerned and systemic approach to food. In contrast, the SPI and farmer activists argue integrating both concepts is no way to find reconciliation. By focusing on the opposite aspects underlying the food sovereignty and food security narrative, the SPI and farmer activists insist that as long as food policy in Indonesia still uses the food security narrative, a concerned and systemic approach to food cannot be obtained.

Furthermore, the space for engagement in policy by farmers/producers and consumers has been provided by the government, yet the government still views them as different entities that are not connected to each other. The government provides opportunity for
farmers/producers in the engagement in policy making rather than consumers. Consumers are treated as passive entities; their rights to get healthy, non-dangerous and affordable food are protected by consumer’s law number 19/1999, yet consumers are not likely to engage in policy making related to food.

Moreover, contemporary peasant organisations such as the SPI, API and others, which may have roots in leftist ideology, are perceived as radical social movement organisations that are not in line with government policies. The engagement of peasant organisations in the policy making process are ruled by laws, but it is claimed to be only a formality in the name of civil society participation. The government is also believed to still prioritise farmer organisations established by them, such as Gapoktan, KHTI and KTNA. Despite the laws, presidential decrees and ministry regulations promoting CSOs engagement in public provisions, in practice the evidence of this engagement is minimal.

**Recommendation**

To determine a concerted and systematic approach to food and to achieve food security goals, two influencing factors need to be addressed. First, the government should be clear at the conceptual stage before deciding to use frameworks in the law. Understanding global discourses related to food frameworks (food sovereignty and food security) is crucial to avoiding misleading definitions. This will also help the government to have a proper foundation to formulate policies. Furthermore, learning from success stories is important. For example, before trying to integrate food sovereignty into food security, the government could learn from Belo Horizonte, Brazil, that has been internationally recognised in successfully attaining a zero hunger policy. Indeed, the government should understand and take into account Indonesia’s characteristics before duplicating policies from other countries. However, to some extent, copying policy from other countries saves time and energy compared to defining “original” policies. Additionally, copying policies from other countries might be suitable to Indonesia since the governance system can be unpredictable (thus avoiding changes to policy every time a new cabinet is established).

Second, the government should be able to involve more stakeholders in designing policy. Involvement by CSOs, especially peasant organisations, will help the government address food insecurity at a basic level (Candel, 2014). It is also necessary for the government to establish a Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) in the governmental forum, which requires a willingness on the part of government to embrace the input from CSOs. Unlike Musrenbang that is decentralised and more likely a ceremonial occasion to formulate
Planning Development Agendas, CSM is not a government body but a forum for CSOs to get involved in governmental forums.

**Gap between theory and practice**

The integrating of food sovereignty and food security that Jarosz (2014) postulated is likely to happen at a local level rather than at the national level is difficult to analyse. The conflict that is likely to happen at national level in integrating the food sovereignty and food security narrative has never occurred, since the Indonesian version of food sovereignty is closer to the food management definition rather than La Via Campesina’s definition. Additionally, local governments are likely to fully adopt the food sovereignty definition given by central government, as it is not the nature of local governments to conceptualise the Municipality Law by themselves. Therefore, Jarosz’s postulation cannot be applied in Indonesia. Furthermore, food security governance that is believed as a way to reconcile food sovereignty and food security does not have a place yet in the Indonesian governance system. Unreliable and unpredictable government situations, along with the shuffle of CSO engagement in policy making and implementation are crucial issues that restrain the Indonesian government from adopting the food security governance concept. Albeit, there is also a possibility to force the government to comply with the food security governance model when Indonesia signs the agreement with the UN to implement the GSF. Nevertheless, as has been discussed earlier, food sovereignty advocates still witness challenges in global food security governance in term of involvement of agribusiness corporates. Therefore, to some extent, implementing the GSF indeed adopts the food sovereignty narrative, however, it is unlikely to be the full reconciliation of Jarosz’s (2014) model.

**Limitations and suggestions for further research**

This research focused on the national level; however, since Indonesia has large regions and diverse cultures, implementation of every policy in every region would be slightly different due to socio-economic, cultural and leadership influences. Therefore, to get an in-depth portrayal of whether integrating food sovereignty into food security is working at practical and local levels, conducting research in one or two cities as study cases is recommended. For example, cities such as Bandung and Surabaya, that are noted as having strong leaders who are successfully implementing environment and social justice programmes are worth noting to analyse.
Another limitation for this study is that the research was conducted in the early stages of RPJMN 2015-2019; as such, data of the implementation is non-existent. Therefore, analysis can only be carried out based on the planning documents. Moreover, due to technical issues in conducting interviews, some respondents preferred to provide the researcher with documents that they wrote or produced rather than participating in the interviews, as explained in chapter 3. Hence, some aspects that were not clear in the documents could not be confirmed. In accordance, this research did not discuss the differences between peasants, farmers, farmer labour or commodity farmers who are apparently associated with different kinds of peasant/farmer associations. Suggestions for further research include considering perceptions about food security from different peasant or farmer organisations and ways to elaborate CSO engagement in policy processes.
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### Appendices

#### Appendix 1

**Table of interviewees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee 1</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Interview held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Bappenas/National Planning and Development Bureau)</td>
<td>Head of Agriculture Planning Division</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>Senior Researcher (former of Head of Institute Agricultural Technology, Central Java, the Ministry of Agriculture)</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
<td>Serikat Petani Indonesia (SPI)</td>
<td>General secretary of SPI</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
<td>Farmer activist</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI)</td>
<td>Senior researcher in LIPI</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Sample of interview protocol in English

Interview protocol

My name is Azizah Nur Hapsari, I am a Masters student of Cardiff University with the subject of European Spatial Planning and Environment Policy. At the moment I am conducting a Masters thesis with the title: Integrating Sovereignty Into Food Security: The Case of Indonesia. I am interested in learning about how integrating the food sovereignty framework into the food security framework in Indonesian food policy can provide concerted and systematic approaches to food from the perspective of policy makers, NGOs and civil society bodies.

Thank you for your willingness to take part in this research. The interview will take about 60 minutes and I would like your permission to tape-record this interview, so I may accurately document the information you convey. In addition, I would like your permission to write up the finding from the interview by quoting your words. If at any time during the interview you wish to discontinue the use of the recorder or the interview itself, please feel free to let me know. All of your responses are confidential.

At this time I would like to remind you to sign the consent form as agreement to participate in this research, an electronic signature is acceptable. Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary. If at any time you need to stop or take a break, please let me know. You may also withdraw your participation at any time without consequences.
Interview protocol in Bahasa Indonesia

Saya Azizah Nur Hapsari, mahasiswa Master degree dari Cardiff University dengan subject study European Spatial Planning and Environment Policy. Saat ini saya sedang melakukan penelitian untuk Master thesis, dengan judul: integrating sovereignty into food security policy: the case of Indonesia. Saya tertarik untuk meneliti tentang bagaimana integrasi framework kedaulatan pangan ke framework ketahanan pangan di kebijakan pangan Indonesia dari perspektif pembuat kebijakan, aktivis NGO dan civil society, dapatkah integrasi tersebut menghasilkan pendekatan yang kongkrit dan systemic terhadap pangan?

Saya ucapkan terimakasih atas ketersediaan Bapak/Ibu dalam studi ini. Interview akan membutuhkan waktu 60 menit, dan saya meminta ijin Bapak/Ibu untuk merekam percakapan selama interview. Saya juga meminta ijin Bapak/Ibu interviewee untuk meng-quote percakapan selama interview, dan juga mentranslatekannya ke Bahasa Inggris.

CONSENT FORM

Study Title: Integrating Sovereignty into Food Security Policy : the case of Indonesia

Student name: Azizah Nur Hapsari

- The study has been explained to me in a language that I comprehend. I understand what will happen during the interview and what is expected of me.
- I have been informed that it is my right to refuse to take part in the interview today and that if I choose to refuse I do not have to give a reason, and that it will not prejudice the care that I can expect to receive now, or in the future.
- I have been informed that anything I say during the interview today will remain completely confidential: my name will not be used nor any other information that could be used to identify me.
- It has been explained that sometimes the researchers find it helpful to use my own words when writing up the findings of this research. I understand that any use of my words would be completely anonymous (without my name). I have been told that I can decide whether I permit my words to be used in this way.

Please tick (√) to response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I agree to take part in the study:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree that my own words may be used anonymously in the report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of participant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (in capital letters)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE OF SIGNATURE (in DD/MM/YYYY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of student:

I have discussed the study with the respondent named above, in a language he/she can comprehend. I believe he/she has understood my explanation and agrees to take part in the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (in capital letters)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE OF SIGNATURE (in DD/MM/YYYY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Sample of interview questions and responses from farmer activist

Thank you for your participation. I believe your input will be valuable for this research.

1. Related to human right to food
   a) How does the Indonesian government translate food policy?

   The new food law has received the food sovereignty concept and food resiliency, however in general, the food law has inserted opposite concepts recklessly. Therefore, in 2015, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (DPR/House of Representative) has set the agenda to revise this new Food Law. The new Food Law is too permissive and open, because the era of President Yudhono was likely to accept any notion, even opposite ideas. Laws in Yudhoyono era tended to be so, that is why for instance, Law of Koperasi and Law of Water have then been canceled by the Constitution Court.

   b) What is relationship between food security and human right?

   Food security in the government’s perception is only limited to technical issues, such as availability and accessible of food for people. The government doesn’t link food security with human rights. The technical measurement is food price is affordable and low import.

   c) How do you perceive food security and food sovereignty? Do you think both concepts can be integrated?

   Since the food law number 12/2012 was enacted, up to now there is neither discussion nor socialisation to explain what is food sovereignty. Many of the bureaucrats and officers don’t have proper knowledge about that. Even some parties, especially in the Ministry of Agriculture still perceive that food sovereignty is an ‘enemy’ of food security. They were provoked by NGOs who are against food sovereignty. They worry because food sovereignty is interpreted as refusing imports. For some bureaucrats it means Indonesia isolates themselves from global economy.

2. Related to national governance
   a) What is your opinion to translate Food Law number 18/2012 to decentralisation system?

   My opinion, as I am doing research about food sovereignty, is that food sovereignty should be translated as ‘farmer sovereignty to food’. It means, local government should ensure access and control of farmers upon agricultural resources. I divide it into eight
resources; access and control over land, water, sea, fertilizer, drugs, technology, production and household consumption.

b) To what extent does the central government gives flexibility to local government in implementing Food Law number 18/2012

Currently, I am conducting research in Tapi Kalimantan Selatan, one of four research locations in 2015. The director of the Agency for Food Security and staff have not had knowledge about what food sovereignty is. Local government is always waiting for instruction from central government, as they don’t have their own initiative to have discussion or seminars related to food sovereignty. Therefore, up to now, there is not any single action for food sovereignty, even their knowledge is still very minimal.

c) Integrating food sovereignty into food security leads to several consequences, one of them is giving priority to small farmers, what kind of instruments of the government should support that?

Local government still don’t have proper perception upon these matters. At the moment, all attention is paid to commodities, production, and self-supporting. Farmers are only production tools. Regions cannot do much because instructions from central government are ambivalent. Essentially, local government has the ability to start to survey farmers. In general, farmers occupy lands below 2 hectares. Thus, all the farmers should be given more attention. For a small farmer definition, Indonesia doesn’t have the ‘small-farmer’. All are generalised as farmer. Farmer labour are not farmer according to Law number 19/2013. Therefore, we need to formulate, what is small-farmer?

d) What kind of partnership and with whom should the government enter into partnership in order to achieve food security

For food security, partnership should be done with all stakeholders. Furthermore, the government and market actors act in accordance with their roles.

e) Related to prices of staple food, what does the government do to control the staple food prices?

Currently, the government intervention is minimal. The government does not intervene in the market, only BULOG, although it is not significant. In harvest feast, BULOG asked to buy farmers’ rice so that the price of farmers’ rice does not fall. As an example, in these three years the grain prices are always on top of HPP. Then, if price is in peak, BULOG asked for market operation. Rice is directly being sold to consumers. In general, either in purchase or market operation, BULOG’s action is enough to affect the market. The research revealed, farmers dared to bargain when HPP’s rise is announced.
f) How much government budget is given to implement food security?
   
   It is difficult to answer, budget for food security is in Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Work and BULOG.

   g) To what extent does the local government prioritise local food? do they have any relationship with the decentralisation?
   
   Yes, I do agree with this integration. As many references I have read. Food sovereignty is completing the food security concept, as strategy to achieve food security. the agriculture development objectives at a national level are still food security yet to increase dignity and prosperity of farmers is through food sovereignty.

h) How does the government perceive peasant organisations in Indonesia? Do governments have partnership with them in implementing food policy?

If what you mean is Indonesian Peasant Union (SPI), not so much partnerships have been entered into by government. In fact, the general perception of the government to SPI is still negative.

i) Do the local governments give priority to the local food production, if yes, to what extent and what is relationship with decentralisation?

In general, discourse is quite massive, but no real actions. Many times, the government announce that Raskin (rice for poor) will be replaced with local food, but I don’t know the updated information about its realisation.

3. Related to international governance

   a) What is the government's attitude to free trade agreements and food imports, after the enactment of the Food Law No. 18/2012 which includes the three major concepts, self-sufficiency, food sovereignty and food security?, whether the government will change the policy direction of the free market and the import?

   I don’t know much about this issue I am afraid. Yet, I estimate we have changed so much. We will still be able to receive imports but as long as we need it. We also depend on the international market if we have surplus productions. Currently, the Ministry of Agriculture has targeted the 10 million tons rice surplus also corn.

b) Does government have partnerships with GMO companies?

   I don’t know whether there is an agreement with GMO companies, but imported soy and corn to Indonesia are not GMOs’ products.
c) Does the agreement with international bodies such as FAO influence the
government in designing food policy?

Yes, I don’t know in detail. Yet in general, FAO is very influential on the Indonesian
government. Including, when FAO was yet to be firmly on the food sovereignty narrative,
then Indonesia was somewhat half-hearted.

Thank you for your time and sharing your knowledge.
Sample of interview questions for farmer activist in Bahasa Indonesia

1. Berkaitan dengan human right to food
   a) Bagaimana menurut anda pemerintah Indonesia menterjemahkan kebijakan pangan?, adakah yang berbeda dari UU pangan no 18/2012 dengan UU pangan sebelumnya?
   b) Bagaimana pemerintah memandang ketahanan pangan dengan hak asasi manusia?
   c) Bagaimana pemerintah memandang konsep food security dan food sovereignty?, apakah menurut anda kedua konsep tersebut bisa terintegrasi?

2. Berkaitan dengan national governance
   a) menurut anda bagaimana menterjemahkan UU pangan no 18/2012 kedalam system desentralisasi?
   b) Sampai sejauh mana pemerintah pusat memberikan keleluasaan kepada pemerintah daerah dalam menterjermahkan UU Pangan no 18/2012
   c) Mengintegrasikan kedaulatan pangan kedalam ketahanan pangan berkonekuensi untuk memprioritaskan petani kecil, instrument apa yang harus dimiliki oleh pemerintah daerah untuk mendukung hal tersebut?
   d) Kerjasama seperti apa dan dengan siapa, pemerintah daerah harus lakukan untuk mencapai ketahanan pangan
   e) Menurut anda bagaimana cara pemerintah mengontrol bahan kebutuhan pokok?
   f) Seberapa besar budget pemerintah untuk mengimplementasikan kebijakan ketahanan pangan?
      a. Bagaimana pemerintah Indonesia memandang serikat petani di Indonesia?, apakah selama ini pemerintah berpatner dengan mereka dalam mengimplementasikan kebijakan pangan?
      b. Apakah pemerintah daerah memprioritaskan produksi pangan local, jika iya sampai sejauh mana?, dan bagaimana keterkaitannya dengan desentralisasi?

3. Berkaitan dengan global governance
   a. Bagaimana sikap pemerintah dengan perjanjian pasar bebas dan impor pangan, setelah ditetapkannya UU Pangan no 18/2012 yang didalamnya memuat tiga konsep besar, self-sufficiency, food severiegnty and food security, apakah pemerintah akan mengubah arah kebijakan pasar bebas dan impor?
   b) Apakah pemerintah menjalin kerjasama dengan perusahaan GMO?
c) Apakah perjanjian dengan badan international seperti FAO mempengaruhi pemerintah dalam menentukan kebijakan pangan
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