

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND

Indonesia's vast territorial waters with large marine resources have an important role in Indonesia's sustainability because they contain fishery resources that have great potential as a source of new economic growth as well as being one of the major factors of national development. As one of the largest maritime and archipelagic countries in the world, Indonesia has sea waters of around 5.8 million km² or around 75 percent of the total area of Indonesia. This area comprises 0.3 million km² of territorial sea waters; 2.8 million km² of Indonesian sea waters; and 2.7 million km² of the sea in the Indonesian Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). In these vast territorial waters of Indonesia's seas, there are large fishery resources.

Marine products such as shrimp, tuna, squid, octopus, crab, and seaweed are highly sought-after commodities. The large amount of fisheries production in Indonesia needs to be maintained. Without good management and supervision, fisheries in Indonesia are vulnerable to violations. However, it turns out that the abundance of fishery resources in Indonesian sea waters has attracted the attention of foreign parties to enjoy them illegally through illegal fishing activities.

Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing threat has been going on for years and it is very detrimental to Indonesia because of the large number of resources stolen by violator ships and the destruction of its marine ecosystem. There are several terminologies commonly used to explain matters relating to illegal fishing activities, namely illegal (invalid), unreported (absence of reports to those concerned), unregulated (not regulated/written in law), or commonly abbreviated with IUU Fishing. Some of these terminologies have their understanding and are commonly used among observers, reviewers, and international institutions, such as FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), which pay great attention to the existence and preservation of marine fisheries resources. (Muhamad S. V., 2012)

However, this threat was not dealt with firmly beforehand by the government even though the right to act is legal. This is because illegal boats have passed through Indonesian territorial waters, which already have laws and regulations to deal with them. The legislation in question refers to the determination of the continental shelf boundary between Indonesia and Vietnam which was agreed upon and signed on June 26, 2003, and ratified by Law No. 18 of 2007 which had previously been regulated in UNCLOS 1982.

However, this sparked sustainability negotiations as Vietnam still has not accepted the agreement due to the overlapping of Vietnamese traditional fishing areas which is still being carried out today. This meeting was held in 2010, negotiations on setting maritime boundaries between Indonesia and Vietnam have been carried out many times but have not found a middle point. Thus in 2017, the Indonesian government took steps to change its policy regarding securitization carried out for Vietnam's violations.

Unlike the previous Indonesian leadership, the government nowadays has implemented policies such as the release of maps. However, due to the absence of firm action against these illegal vessels, such as the sinking of vessels or changes in policy, the treatment of these violators seems ineffective and does not provide a deterrent effect.

This style of leadership is different when viewed from the aspect of solving illegal fishing cases that have occurred. During the leadership period before President Jokowi, existing policies were not carried out intensely following the orders of the previous president, namely President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. The administration of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono seemed to be more concerned with the implications that would occur in relations between other countries if they carried out an intense act of drowning.

This happened because illegal fish theft was not initially seen as a security issue in securitization. Securitization explains that security is a self-referential practice. In the securitization process, the practice turns a problem into a security problem that is caused not on the basis of a real threat, but due to the emphasis on the problem presented as a threat. An existential threat is a threat discussed by actors in viewing an issue. This process is carried out through language rhetoric called the Speech Act.

This paper outlines the strategy of Indonesia's government Speech Act practice against the IUUF case committed by Vietnam in the Natuna Sea in 2017, because that year there was a change in the Indonesian government's policy towards cases of violations committed by Vietnam. Many Vietnamese fishermen enter the Natuna (waters) because they consider their fishing industry vital in the southern region. That is why on the latest 2017 map there is a change of name in the northern part of the Natuna Sea to become the North Natuna Sea.

Through the behavior of Indonesia's Speech Act towards Vietnam, illegal fishing activities that are cross-border in nature are expected to be handled properly. The results of this research paper want to reveal an analysis of policy factors from the Speech Act behavior carried out by the Indonesian government in this case.

1.1. Research Question

Based on the background of the problem and how the problem can be identified, the authors decide to determine the formulation of the problem in the form of **‘How can Jokowi securitized Vietnam IUUF violations through the Speech Act approach?’**

1.2. Theoretical Framework

In this case, the author tries to link Indonesia's policy in sinking the IUUF ships through the Copenhagen School Securitization Theory. IUUF securitization by Indonesia is very interesting to discuss because there are two focus issues. First, in the context of securitization, securitization actions are carried out to bring the status of a security problem into an urgent problem that brings firm action on the issue that is currently happening to security urgency. Meanwhile, IUUF Indonesia's securitization itself was carried out in the context of implementing the law. This happened due to weak law enforcement and the international ecosystem, so the Indonesian government carried out securitization to undertake law enforcement.

Secondly, this securitization process is also carried out apart from the security and sovereignty factors of the state, there is also the context of environmental security. In other words, Indonesia has been trying to broaden and deepen security issues related to its maritime area. Through significant Speech Acts and media support, the community's commitment to dealing with threats to Indonesia's maritime area has become high support for the government's policy of sinking illegal ships.

Security studies were initially interpreted only as military threats with state actors as the cause. But in a more modern sense, according to Buzan, Weaver, and Wilde, security studies focus on non-state actors and non-military threats. According to the Copenhagen School, it was explained that security studies are not only about state and military issues, but also several other fields, namely economic, political, social, and environmental. (Buzan, Waever, & Wilde, 1998)

From the theory of securitization provided by the Copenhagen School, securitization actors use the Speech Act as a weapon to construct issues into security threats. However, this can be said to have been securitized when the actors involved have agreed that the issue is a threat, in that urgent action is needed to address the issue. (Buzan, Waever, & Wilde, 1998)

An issue can be securitized when a securitizing actor declares the urgency of a threat as a warning to the public about the dangers that will arise from an issue. This action will become a tool to sway public opinion and allow these securitization actors to mobilize state power in forming a policy to stop existing threats. The use of the Speech Act by securitization actors determines the success or failure of a securitization process.

The Copenhagen School also explains the important process of securitization from the behavioral factors of securitization actors about how and when a problem can be considered a threat. This theory explains that the securitization process will bear fruit when the community as a threatened reference object believes in future threats. So, it can be said that the object of reference from this theory is a group of individuals and society.

Then, an issue will be desecuritized again when a desecuritized actor emerges who states that a threat no longer threatens the security of a group, or anything related to the survival of a society. Desecuritization actors can be all actors, both state and non-state actors. The focus of the securitization and desecuritization processes is on language as a means of conveying messages used by securitization actors to convince the object of reference that there is a threat, or that the threat has ended on a particular issue.

1.3. Hypothesis

Securitization through the Speech Act approach carried out by Jokowi towards the society succeeded in bringing the IUUF issue which was previously considered as not a threat become a security issue that has influenced policy changes.

1.4. Scope of Research

Pragmatically, the 'Speech' was carried out in 2015 during President Jokowi's speech about the vision of Nawa Cita, namely 'Bringing the country back to protect the entire nation and providing a sense of security to all citizens, through free and active foreign policy, trusted national security and development. integrated Tri Matra state defense based on national interests and strengthening identity as a maritime nation.

This indirectly becomes a trigger for the 'Act' to be performed. Then with the claims from the Indonesian side regarding releasing a new map of the Republic of Indonesia in 2017. It was a starting point that the issue was believed to be a security issue, so securitization was created.

The discussion of this thesis only focuses on the analysis of policy changes from the Speech Act process that occurred in 2017 by the securitization of the Indonesian government against

Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing violations committed by Vietnam in Indonesian waters.

1.5. Research Purposes

Research Objectives and Benefits In writing this research, the author expects several things, namely:

1. Analyzing the Indonesia's Speech Act to domestic society.
2. Answering the hypothesis that the 'Speech Act' action is a firm action by Indonesia against Vietnam's illegal behavior.
3. Fulfilling part of the graduation requirements in obtaining a bachelor's degree (S-1) in International Relations.

1.6. Research Methods

In this thesis research, the author used a literature analysis study method regarding the reasons for Indonesia's Speech Act as a qualitative securitization behavior towards Vietnam. Data and information related to the research, both general description and details of this research were obtained through primary data and secondary data. Primary data is data in the form of books and journals that are directly related to this research. Secondary data were obtained from social media, online news, internet sites, and other relevant sources that could build and support the authenticity of the data in this research thesis.

Furthermore, as author uses data-based analysis techniques, and then from these data conclusions are drawn that show the behavior of the Speech Act carried out by the Indonesian government towards Vietnam. Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and compiling data that could be obtained from interviews, field notes, and documentation, by organizing data into categories, describing it into units, synthesizing, arranging it into patterns, choosing what is important and will be studied, and make conclusions so that they could easily be understood by ourself and others (Sugiyono, 2018).