

Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews

Widianingsih, Y. (2026). Welfare Populism's Dilemma: Free Meal Program vs. Energy Subsidies Amidst Oil Price Shocks. *Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews*, 5(2), 48-59.

ISSN 2827-9735

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1996.05.02.174

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research


The *Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews* is an open-access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews is a peer-reviewed International Journal of the Asian Institute of Research. The journal covers scholarly articles in the interdisciplinary fields of law and humanities, including constitutional and administrative law, criminal law, civil law, international law, linguistics, history, literature, performing art, philosophy, religion, visual arts, anthropology, culture, and ethics studies. The Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews is an Open Access Journal that can be accessed and downloaded online for free. Thus, ensuring high visibility and increase of citations for all research articles published. The journal aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of law.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

Welfare Populism's Dilemma: Free Meal Program vs. Energy Subsidies Amidst Oil Price Shocks

Yuliani Widianingsih¹ 

¹ Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta

Correspondence: Yuliani Widianingsih, yulianiwidianingsih@upnvj.ac.id
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2019-2845>

Abstract

The Free Nutritious Meal (Makan Bergizi Gratis/MBG) program was engineered as a crucial instrument of welfare populism, designed to consolidate the political legitimacy of Indonesia's post-election administration. However, its implementation has collided with an exogenous crisis beyond the state's control: an extreme surge in global crude oil prices in the second quarter of 2026. This article examines the government's dilemma, trapped between two populist policies directly affecting the grassroots economy: maintaining blanket fuel subsidies or fulfilling the multibillion-dollar MBG campaign promise. Utilizing the political economy framework of fiscal space and fiscal squeeze, this study finds that the state faces an asymmetrical tradeoff. Reallocating energy subsidies to fund the MBG would trigger imported inflation, destroying the purchasing power of the working class and the poor. Conversely, delaying the MBG to secure energy prices erodes the regime's political capital. The analysis concludes that constrained fiscal capacity ultimately forces the government to rationalize its populist promises, demonstrating that without energy independence and elastic fiscal space, welfare populism in emerging markets remains profoundly vulnerable to global and geopolitical volatility.

Keywords: Welfare Populism, Free Nutritious Meal, Energy Subsidies, Exogenous Shock, Fiscal Space, Political Economy, Indonesia

1. Introduction

In the landscape of electoral democracy, the transition from campaign rhetoric to public policy governance is frequently tested by rigid macroeconomic structures and existing conditions. The Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) program, the flagship initiative of President Prabowo Subianto's administration in Indonesia, represents the pinnacle of electoral promises, which by design, is championed as a long-term investment in human capital aimed at eradicating stunting as preparation for Indonesia's Golden Generation of 2045. Furthermore, within the political sphere, the initiative operates as a salient mechanism of welfare populism, engineered to penetrate grassroots demographics and fortify the political legitimacy of the post-electoral regime (Warburton, 2018). Fulfilling this mandate necessitates a monumental fiscal allocation, with the National Nutrition Agency anticipating an annual expenditure of nearly Rp 400 trillion.

The operationalization of this flagship mega-program encountered a severe collision with an exogenous macroeconomic shock in the second quarter of 2026: a precipitous escalation in global crude oil prices, which surged past the US\$110 per barrel threshold (Tuttle et al., 2026). For Indonesia, a net oil importer since 2004, such external volatility catalyzed an exponential expansion of domestic energy compensation and subsidy obligations, profoundly outstripping the foundational assumptions of the 2026 State Budget (APBN). Constrained by the statutory rigidity of State Finance Law No. 17/2003, which mandates a fiscal deficit ceiling of 3% of GDP, the administration is currently ensnared in an acute fiscal squeeze. This macroeconomic exigency has precipitated a profound policy trade-off: the reallocation of essential energy subsidies to capitalize on the MBG, thereby endangering the economy through imported inflation and the erosion of grassroots purchasing power, or the deferment of this populist mandate to preserve energy price stability, a move that would catalyze political delegitimization and provide significant leverage to parliamentary opposition (Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025).

Existing scholarship concerning the MBG and analogous large-scale state feeding interventions has predominantly operationalized these initiatives through the paradigms of public health, specifically regarding stunting mitigation and cognitive capital formation (Smith & Haddad, 2015) or the micro-logistical exigencies of supply chain optimization within archipelagic geographies (Aspinall & Berenschot, 2019). Parallely, the broader political economy discourse has extensively scrutinized welfare populism, typically conceptualizing it as a strategic instrument for electoral mobilization and clientelistic distribution in the Global South (Mares & Carnes, 2009; Weyland, 2001). Nevertheless, a critical analytical gap persists at the intersection of these thematic domains. Limited research has interrogated the real-time political economy mechanisms activated when a nascent, capital-intensive populist welfare mandate collides with non-discretionary macroeconomic stabilization expenditures, such as energy subsidies, within the rigid parameters of a constrained fiscal space.

To address this critical analytical gap, this study operationalizes a qualitative, explanatory political economy methodology. This study synthesizes the paradigm of welfare populism, which theorizes capital-intensive social interventions as essential mechanisms for regime hegemony and political survival, with the macroeconomic constructs of Fiscal Space and the Fiscal Squeeze (Heller, 2005; Hood & Dixon, 2015). This integrated theoretical framework elucidates the specific mechanisms through which exogenous shocks paralyze domestic policy autonomy and constrain sovereign decision-making. Methodologically, the inquiry utilizes rigorous secondary data analysis and process tracing, drawing on the Ministry of Finance's 2026 APBN fiscal posture, longitudinal global oil price metrics, and inflationary indices from Statistics Indonesia (BPS). Furthermore, this study applies a systematic discourse analysis to official state communications, parliamentary deliberations, and salient media narratives produced between January and May 2026, thereby tracing the strategic framing and rationalization of this acute fiscal-political trilemma.

The analytical focus of this inquiry is rigorously delimited: it interrogates the multifaceted macroeconomic and political trade-offs inherent in capitalizing on the populist MBG mandate relative to the preservation of energy subsidies during the 2026 global oil price exigency. Accordingly, the scope is strategically confined to macro-level fiscal policy architecture and elite political economy dynamics. This research explicitly eschews any empirical evaluation of nutritional efficacy, public health outcomes, or granular micro-logistical operationalization of the MBG program within local educational contexts. Furthermore, the analysis operationalizes the 3% fiscal deficit ceiling as a non-discretionary institutional constraint, refraining from exploring the complex legal procedures necessary for amending the State Finance Law. By isolating this acute fiscal-political trilemma, this study seeks to provide a precise anatomical interrogation of policy survival mechanisms during a period of profound macroeconomic volatility.

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Academic discourse on state-orchestrated social interventions in emerging democracies has bifurcated into two salient analytical trajectories. The primary trajectory interrogates the institutionalization of the welfare state, scrutinizing the mechanisms through which developing polities expand social safety nets via formal rights-based frameworks (Haggard & Kaufman, 2008). Conversely, the secondary trajectory maintains acute relevance to the

Indonesian capital-intensive social expenditures within the paradigms of electoral clientelism and patronage-driven politics (Aspinall & Berenschot, 2019; Warburton, 2018). Extant scholarship has rigorously documented the strategic operationalization of cash transfers and subsidized commodities by populist actors to circumvent bureaucratic mediation, thereby cultivating grassroots fealty and consolidating electoral hegemony (Weyland, 2001).

Within the specific Indonesian geopolitical landscape, scholars have identified a transition toward "programmatic clientelism" or welfare populism, wherein universalistic mandates are deployed as instruments of immediate electoral capitalization rather than structural poverty mitigation (Aspinall, 2013). Nevertheless, a systematic review of this literature reveals a profound analytical gap: the preponderance of these inquiries conceptualizes welfare populism as an endogenous political phenomenon, presupposing a stable macroeconomic environment or focusing exclusively on domestic fiscal maneuverability. Consequently, there is a substantive scarcity of research interrogating the institutional survivability and strategic metamorphosis of capital-intensive populist mandates when subjected to precipitous exogenous macroeconomic shocks, such as a global energy crisis, particularly within the rigid institutional constraints of a statutory 3% fiscal deficit ceiling.

This inquiry establishes its academic novelty by situating the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) mandate at this under-researched intersection. By interrogating the collision between an immutable, capital-intensive populist promise and an uncontrollable exogenous variable, the 2026 global crude oil price exigency, this study shifts the analytical lens from domestic electoral strategy to the macro-political economy of crisis management and state survival mechanisms.

The primary analytical pillar of this inquiry is the Welfare Populism paradigm. Within the contemporary discourse of comparative politics, welfare populism is conceptualized not merely as a redistributive mechanism but as a salient strategic instrument engineered to maximize regime legitimacy and consolidate political hegemony. Weyland (2001) posits that populist economic frameworks prioritize immediate, highly visible distributional outcomes directed toward unorganized demographics, frequently at the expense of long-term macroeconomic stability. These interventions are strategically operationalized through the personalistic appeal of the sovereign, framed as moral imperatives to circumvent technocratic mediation. The MBG program perfectly operationalizes the paradigm of welfare populism; it functions as a highly visible, salient intervention that delivers immediate distributional benefits to millions of households, thereby serving as a strategic instrument engineered to fortify the political legitimacy and personalistic appeal of the incumbent administration as its primary campaign mandate.

Within the parameters of this inquiry, the welfare populism paradigm is operationalized through a rigorous interrogation of the discursive framing and strategic political conduct of state elites. Specifically, this necessitates a systematic process tracing of the administration's rhetorical defense of the MBG mandate against technocratic imperatives for fiscal retrenchment. The analysis observes the institutional reluctance to bifurcate the program from its foundational grand narrative, identifying the specific linguistic stratagems utilized to elevate the initiative from a discretionary policy instrument to a "sacred mandate" essential for the preservation of regime legitimacy and political survival.

The secondary analytical pillar of this inquiry is situated within the macroeconomic paradigms of Fiscal Space and the Fiscal Squeeze. Within the discourse of public policy governance, Heller (2005) operationalizes fiscal space as the budgetary latitude available to a sovereign administration to mobilize resources for strategic mandates without compromising its long-term fiscal sustainability. Parallely, the construct of a fiscal squeeze (Hood & Dixon, 2015) elucidates the institutional paralysis that occurs when the state is ensnared between escalating, non-discretionary expenditure obligations and the rigid ceiling of constrained revenue streams.

As a net oil importer with a narrow tax base (historically hovering around 10% of GDP), Indonesia's fiscal space is structurally fragile. The sudden surge in the Indonesian Crude Price (ICP) above US\$110 per barrel acts as an exogenous shock that forcefully contracts the space. Because the government must automatically inject trillions of rupiah to subsidize fuel and prevent catastrophic domestic inflation, a severe fiscal squeeze has materialized.

The legal constraint of the State Finance Law (Law No. 17/2003), which prohibits the budget deficit from exceeding 3% of GDP, transforms this squeeze from an economic challenge into a hard institutional barrier.

Within the methodological parameters of this research, these constructs are rigorously operationalized through procedural and quantitative interrogation of state finance architectures. Specifically, this study conducts a systematic sensitivity analysis of the 2026 APBN relative to global oil price volatility, thereby calculating the precipitous crowding-out effect, wherein incremental escalations in crude benchmarks non-discretionarily cannibalize the fiscal space originally earmarked for the MBG mandate. By synthesizing empirical budget posture adjustments from the Ministry of Finance, the analysis demonstrates the zero-sum nature of discretionary social expenditure during the Q2 2026 macroeconomic exigencies.

The theoretical framework of this study posits that the administration is ensnared within an irreconcilable trilemma, unable to simultaneously operationalize the capital-intensive MBG mandate, mitigate the exogenous crude oil shock via energy subsidies, and adhere to the non-discretionary statutory fiscal deficit ceiling. Consequently, the operationalization of this synthesis necessitates a rigorous mapping of domestic policy configurations onto a complex matrix of political and macroeconomic trade-offs. Should the state prioritize the MBG through the abandonment of fuel subsidies, it risks catalyzing a period of imported hyperinflation that would effectively erode the purchasing power of the grassroots demographics the populist agenda sought to mobilize. Conversely, prioritizing energy price stability through the cancellation of the MBG would precipitate a precipitous collapse of the regime's electoral credibility. By utilizing this synthesized paradigm, this study systematically interrogates the mechanisms through which the sovereign navigates this exigency, frequently characterized by the "silent dilution" of populist mandates, thereby elucidating the structural vulnerabilities of welfare populism within a volatile, globally integrated macroeconomic environment.

3. Research Method

To address the stated analytical objectives, this research operationalizes a qualitative, explanatory case study methodology situated within the rigorous paradigms of the political economy. This research design is strategically engineered to unpack the complex causal mechanisms and elite decision-making processes activated when a precipitous exogenous macroeconomic shock destabilizes an endogenous capital-intensive populist mandate. A qualitative framework is prioritized as the optimal investigative instrument, as the inquiry eschews the statistical measurement of the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) program's outcomes in favor of a systematic interrogation of the government's strategic policy trade-offs amid the Q2 2026 global oil price exigency. Methodologically, this study synthesizes an extensive, structured literature review with a comprehensive document analysis to elucidate the macro-level fiscal and political dynamics governing state survival during this period of profound volatility.

To capture both the material constraints of the state and the political rhetoric of its actors, data were collected from secondary sources spanning the critical period from January to May 2026. First, the macroeconomic and institutional data comprise a rigorous synthesis of official state finance architectures, specifically the 2026 State Budget (APBN) posture, the Ministry of Finance's semester realization reports, Bank Indonesia's strategic monetary reviews, and longitudinal inflationary indices from Statistics Indonesia (BPS). Furthermore, global crude oil benchmarks, specifically Brent Crude and the Indonesian Crude Price (ICP), were operationalized using data from international financial monitors, including Bloomberg and the EIA. Second, this study operationalizes a comprehensive discourse analysis of peer-reviewed journals, working papers, and strategic policy briefs disseminated by authoritative macroeconomic and political think tanks, including the Institute for Development of Economics and Finance (INDEF), the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) Indonesia, and the World Bank. Third, this study operationalizes a comprehensive discourse analysis of salient public pronouncements articulated by pivotal institutional stakeholders—specifically, the President of the Republic of Indonesia, the Minister of Finance, the Head of the National Nutrition Agency, and influential parliamentary faction leadership. These qualitative data were meticulously extracted from a synthesis of official state transcripts, executive press releases, and authoritative national media narratives, including Kompas, the Jakarta Post, and Bisnis Indonesia.

Data analysis was conducted using a two-pronged strategy. First, data tracing investigates the chronological and causal sequence of macroeconomic exigencies through a rigorous process-tracing mechanism. This analytical trajectory maps the progression from the independent variable—the exogenous escalation of global oil prices during the first half of 2026—through the intervening variable of contracted fiscal space and subsequent intra-executive deliberations to the final dependent variable: the ultimate policy configuration regarding the operational scale of the MBG mandate and the preservation of energy subsidy obligations. Second, Thematic data coding is applied specifically to political data, and this step involves coding public statements to identify dominant narratives. Statements were coded into themes such as technocratic prudence (typically from the Ministry of Finance prioritizing deficit limits) versus populist commitment (typically from the executive and coalition parties defending the MBG narrative). This reveals the "silent dilution" compromise discussed in the theoretical framework.

To fortify the analytical validity and empirical reliability of the synthesized findings, this study rigorously operationalizes the paradigm of methodological triangulation (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2018). This study systematically interrogates the multifaceted tension between elite political rhetoric—the normative pronouncements articulated by state actors—and the granular fiscal reality manifested within the empirical state finance architectures of the APBN. Specifically, the administration's discursive framing of the MBG mandate as proceeding "at full scale" is meticulously cross-examined against the longitudinal budgetary allocations and actualized disbursement velocities reported by the Ministry of Finance (MoF).

Furthermore, this study explicitly identifies and mitigates the inherent risks associated with data-specific biases. It recognizes that official state documentation frequently internalizes an optimistic teleology engineered to preserve the market's stability and institutional credibility. Conversely, this study acknowledges that narratives from the parliamentary opposition or salient media outlets may operationalize sensationalist framing to maximize political leverage during periods of volatility. By anchoring the analytical framework within the non-discretionary mathematical rigidity of the 3% fiscal deficit ceiling and objective global crude benchmarks, this study strategically deconstructs partisan framing to provide an anatomical interrogation of the political economy trade-offs currently in play.

4. Results and Discussion

The collision between the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) mandate and the 2026 global crude oil price exigency serves as a salient case study of an endogenous populist agenda subjected to structural paralysis by a precipitous exogenous macroeconomic crisis. Utilizing rigorous process tracing, fiscal posture modeling, and systematic thematic discourse analysis, this inquiry interrogates four critical phases of this political-economy trilemma: the genesis of an acute fiscal squeeze, the institutional fracture bifurcating technocratic prudence from political imperatives, the asymmetrical socioeconomic trade-off inherent in redistributive policy, and the ultimate strategic resolution operationalized through a mechanism of "silent dilution."

4.1 Anatomy of the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) Program

To elucidate the profundity of the 2026 fiscal-political trilemma, it is imperative to first deconstruct the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) mandate through the theoretical prism of welfare populism. As posited by Weyland (2001) and Mares and Carnes (2009), welfare populism is predicated on the massive, unmediated distribution of state resources to cultivate personalistic electoral fealty, thereby circumventing traditional, sluggish bureaucratic mediation. The MBG program operationalizes this paradigm. Originally engineered as "Free School Lunches" during the 2024 electoral cycle, it served as the paramount populist vehicle that propelled the incumbent administration to a decisive victory (Warburton, 2018). Post-inauguration, the regime moved with celerity to institutionalize this mandate, recognizing that its political legitimacy was inextricably linked to its successful delivery. This institutionalization was formalized via Presidential Regulation No. 83 of 2024, which established the National Nutrition Agency, a powerful, standalone executive body reporting directly to the President, thereby centralizing control over the state's ultimate populist instrument (Presiden Republik Indonesia, 2024).

The programmatic targets and discursive goals of the MBG are unprecedented in Indonesian history, designed to project a moral imperative that renders technocratic opposition profoundly difficult to achieve. The program targets an astronomical 82.9 million beneficiaries, including pregnant women and students across the archipelago (Badan Gizi Nasional, 2025a). The official technocratic justification frames the MBG as a critical intervention to eradicate chronic stunting, which hovers around 21.5%, and to catalyze cognitive capital formation for the "Golden Indonesia 2045" teleology (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2025; UNICEF Indonesia, n.d.). However, the political objective is unambiguous: establishing a daily, tangible presence of the sovereign at the dining tables of millions of grassroots households, thereby cementing long-term electoral hegemony and regime stability (Aspinall & Berenschot, 2019).

To finance this mega-project, the state was forced to engineer a massive reallocation of the fiscal architecture. In its inaugural phase within the 2025 State Budget (APBN), the MBG was cautiously capitalized with Rp 71 trillion as a starter fund to establish the requisite institutional architecture (Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024). However, the fiscal trajectory of universal coverage is staggering. Projections estimate that at full-scale implementation by 2026–2029, the MBG will require an annual expenditure oscillating between Rp 400 trillion and Rp 450 trillion, equating to roughly 12% of total state expenditures (Institute for Development of Economics and Finance, 2024, 2026; World Bank, 2025). This represents a massive discretionary commitment for a polity with a stagnant tax ratio, sparking early warnings of a crowding-out effect on other vital developmental sectors, such as infrastructure and human capital development (Basri, 2025).

Even before the 2026 exogenous oil shock, the MBG mandate was plagued by profound structural and logistical vulnerabilities, highlighting the inherent fragility of populist mega-policies in emerging markets. First, the program encountered severe supply chain deficits; domestic production capacities were woefully inadequate to meet the sudden demand for nutritional commodities. The National Food Agency (2025) reported that domestic dairy and beef production could only cover a fraction of the required supply. This forced the state into massive import reliance, contradicting its own nationalist rhetoric of food sovereignty and exposing its mandate to global commodity volatility (Askar et al., 2024). Second, geographic disparities create logistical nightmares. While urban implementation proceeded, executing the supply chain in the outermost disadvantaged regions (3T areas) proved nearly impossible because of deficient cold-storage infrastructure (Badan Pangan Nasional, 2025). Finally, the rapid deployment of decentralized "Service Kitchens" without mature oversight created significant vulnerabilities for rent-seeking behavior and quality dilution by local political elites (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, 2025). Consequently, prior to the global economic deterioration in the second quarter of 2026, the MBG program existed in a state of precarious equilibrium—a colossal apparatus of welfare populism struggling under the weight of its own ambition, structural dependency on imports, and severe fiscal constraints.

4.2 The Exogenous Shock of Global Oil Crisis, Fiscal Squeeze, and Populist Austerity

While the structural vulnerabilities inherent in the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) mandate were already empirically manifest within the domestic landscape, the catalyst that precipitated the metamorphosis of these fragilities into an acute political economy exigency was entirely exogenous. To elucidate this dynamic, it is imperative to interrogate the macroeconomic baseline on which this populist agenda was constructed. The 2026 State Budget (APBN) was legislated during a period of relative global stability, anchored by two profoundly optimistic macroeconomic assumptions: an Indonesian Crude Price (ICP) averaging US\$80 per barrel and an exchange rate of Rp 15,500 per US Dollar (Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025). Within these parameters, the government calculated a sufficient fiscal space to incrementally scale MBG capitalization toward its Rp 400 trillion target while simultaneously preserving blanket energy subsidies for low-octane fuel (Pertalite) and diesel (Solar).

However, during the second quarter of 2026, a compounding global crisis effectively demolished the foundational budgetary assumptions. Escalating geopolitical conflicts in oil-producing regions and severe disruptions in maritime supply chains triggered massive commodity shocks. By May 2026, global crude benchmarks and the ICP surged aggressively, breaching the US\$115 per barrel threshold (Tuttle et al., 2026). Compounding this exigency was the aggressive monetary tightening by the US Federal Reserve, which catalyzed massive capital

flight from the emerging markets. This dual shock severely battered the Indonesian Rupiah, precipitating a depreciation past the Rp 16,500 threshold against the US Dollar (Bank Indonesia, 2026).

Given Indonesia's status as a net oil importer purchasing its hydrocarbon deficit in US Dollars, this "Oil-Currency Nexus" instantaneously generated fiscal hemorrhage. The macroeconomic construct of the fiscal squeeze (Hood & Dixon, 2015) materialized with brutal, mathematical precision. According to fiscal sensitivity matrices published by the Institute for Development of Economics and Finance (Institute for Development of Economics and Finance, 2026), every combined escalation of US\$1 in the ICP and Rp 100 depreciation against the USD adds approximately Rp 9–11 trillion to the state's non-discretionary energy compensation obligations. Consequently, the sovereign was instantaneously saddled with an unanticipated requirement exceeding Rp 300 trillion to absorb the global shock and prevent a catastrophic spike in domestic energy prices (World Bank, 2026). Constrained by the rigid institutional barrier of State Finance Law No. 17/2003, which legally caps the fiscal deficit at 3% of GDP, the administration's discretionary fiscal space was mathematically annihilated.

Faced with this zero-sum game, the administration's strategic response provided a textbook anatomical interrogation of the political economy of welfare populism. Rather than immediately retrenching the capital-intensive MBG mandate to accommodate the energy shock, the government opted to violently insulate this populist initiative by enacting draconian austerity measures across less politically salient sectors. The survival of the MBG—the paramount symbol of regime legitimacy—was prioritized over the optimal functionality of the technocratic state apparatus (Mares & Carnes, 2009; Mietzner, 2020).

To protect the MBG's capitalization, the Ministry of Finance executed an aggressive Automatic Adjustment policy, unilaterally freezing or reallocating up to 10% of the operational and capital expenditure budgets across nearly all ministries and state agencies (Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025). This resulted in the paralysis of vital technocratic functions: new infrastructure projects were halted, capital injections (PMN) for struggling State-Owned Enterprises (BUMN) were deferred, and higher-education research grants were significantly reduced (Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 2025). Furthermore, to secure immediate liquidity for the MBG, the government aggressively accelerated regressive revenue extraction measures, most notably the unpopular execution of the value-added tax (VAT) increase to 12%, passing the financial burden directly onto the middle-class consumer (Basri, 2025).

This phenomenon elucidates a critical characteristic of welfare populism amidst macroeconomic volatility: the state systematically cannibalizes its own developmental capacities and enacts austerity on the middle class before dismantling the distributive programs that secure its grassroots hegemony. However, as the global energy crisis deepened throughout mid-2026, it became evident that these internal austerity measures served merely as temporary firewalls, ultimately proving insufficient to sustain the colossal dual burden of universal free meals and blanket energy subsidies.

4.3 Welfare Populism under the Weight of Imported Inflation

The precipitous contraction of fiscal space, as detailed in the preceding section, transcended a mere bureaucratic budget deficit to fundamentally destabilize the operational logic governing the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) program. Within the theoretical paradigm of welfare populism, the sustainability of capital-intensive distributive interventions is predicated on a relatively stable macroeconomic environment, wherein state resources are predictably channeled to cultivate and consolidate grassroots hegemony (Warburton, 2018; Weyland, 2001). However, the Q2 2026 global crude oil exigency provided a salient anatomical interrogation of the systemic paralysis that occurs when an endogenous political imperative encounters a violent collision with an exogenous macroeconomic shock. This fiscal exigency exposed the MBG not as a resilient social safety net but as a profound structural liability, acutely vulnerable to the "food-energy nexus" of global inflationary volatility.

The causal mechanism of this crisis was driven by imported hyperinflation, which severely degraded the purchasing power of the mandate. As the Indonesian Crude Price (ICP) sustained levels exceeding US\$115 per barrel and the Rupiah experienced significant depreciation, domestic logistical and transportation costs surged

exponentially. According to inflationary indices from Statistics Indonesia (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2026), the transportation sector experienced a precipitous surge of nearly 7.2% year-on-year by mid-2026. Given that the MBG operationalization necessitates massive, daily, and decentralized supply chains to mobilize perishable nutritional commodities—encompassing rice, poultry, and dairy—from rural producers to the vast educational archipelago, this logistical inflation was instantaneously passed on to the unit cost of the meals themselves.

Consequently, the administration was ensnared in an inflationary paradox. The foundational MBG fiscal architecture was rigidly pegged at an average of Rp 15,000 (approximately US\$0.90) per beneficiary per day to satisfy specific caloric and nutritional benchmarks (Badan Gizi Nasional, 2025b). As agricultural and transportation costs escalated, the real purchasing power of this allocation plummeted. A situational analysis synthesized by the World Bank (2026) revealed that maintaining the promised nutritional standards amidst the Q2 exigency required a per-meal upward adjustment of at least Rp 21,000. Scaling this Rp 6,000 deficit across 82 million beneficiaries necessitated an incremental injection exceeding Rp 120 trillion annually, capital the state mathematically lacked due to the concurrent burden of energy subsidies. This fiscal squeeze forced the sovereign to operationalize a strategic "silent dilution" of nutritional quality to preserve political optics and keep the program artificially afloat within the original budgetary ceiling (Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 2025).

Furthermore, the institutional insistence on shielding the MBG mandate from deferment catalyzed a severe "crowding-out" effect within the broader architecture of Indonesia's social protection (Perlinsos) system. To sustain the cash flow for the administration's paramount populist trophy, the Ministry of Finance and Bappenas were forced to quietly defund, delay, or restrict quotas for less politically salient, yet arguably more critical welfare frameworks.

Suprpto et al. (2025) indicate a disturbing trajectory of institutional cannibalization: targeted cash transfers for the extremely poor (BLT) and conditional transfers for maternal health (PKH) experienced significant disbursement delays to prioritize the universal MBG. This validates a salient critique of welfare populism in the Global South: during periods of fiscal scarcity, regimes prioritize universal, highly visible mandates that maximize broad electoral approval at the direct expense of targeted interventions designed for the politically marginalized (Haggard & Kaufman, 2008; Yuda & Ahmada, 2026).

Ultimately, the Q2 2026 exigency transformed the MBG from an offensive political asset into defensive fiscal nightmare. The administration remains locked within a sunk-cost fallacy, forced to cannibalize vital safety nets and bleed the broader state budget to capitalize on an inflation-degraded mandate, thereby demonstrating that without macroeconomic sovereignty, massive populist welfare remains fundamentally unsustainable.

4.4 The Asymmetrical Trade-Off of MBG

Having established the macroeconomic mechanisms of the fiscal squeeze and the resultant inflationary degradation of the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) program, this analysis turns to the socio-political economy of the crisis itself. Within the rigid boundaries of the 3% fiscal deficit cap, the government's inability to simultaneously debt-finance universal MBG coverage and blanket energy subsidies forced a zero-sum political calculus to the fore. By Q3 2026, the administration was forced to weigh the electoral prices of two mutually exclusive macroeconomic scenarios. This dilemma catalyzed the formation of distinct domestic actor coalitions, each lobbying for the preservation of their preferred manifestation of state patronage. In this regard, these are the three possible scenarios that represent the trade-off.

First, the populist imperative scenario is considered. In this scenario, the government fulfills its ultimate campaign promise by fully funding the MBG program at Rp 400 trillion, legally necessitating the removal of energy subsidies (Petalite and Solar) to balance the APBN. From a sociopolitical perspective, the electoral price of this choice is immediate and violently disruptive. Historical precedent in Indonesia demonstrates that fuel price hikes are the most consistent triggers for mass social unrest and immediate drops in presidential approval ratings (Mietzner, 2020). If fuel prices were floated to reflect the US\$115/barrel global reality, the primary victims would be the

urban working class and the lower-middle class—demographics that are highly sensitive to transportation and logistics inflation. The electoral cost is the alienation of highly mobilized, politically articulate demographics.

Otherwise, the government capitulates to global market pressures, maintaining blanket fuel subsidies to suppress domestic inflation while indefinitely suspending or outright canceling the MBG program. Economically, this choice preserves macroeconomic stability and protects the broader purchasing power of the population. However, the electoral price is the catastrophic deflation of the regime's political capital and moral authority. For a presidency built on the narrative of "Golden Indonesia 2045" and the visceral promise of a daily free meal, abandoning the MBG project equates to political bankruptcy. This strips the administration of its primary tool for welfare populism. However, this scenario would be aggressively opposed by the President's inner circle, loyalist grassroots organizations, and the ruling parliamentary coalition, who require the MBG's distributive power to secure their own constituent bases ahead of future regional elections (Pilkada). It would also provide the parliamentary opposition with highly potent political ammunition to frame the administration as deceptive and incompetent (Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 2025). Macroeconomists would support the cancellation of the MBG, and international financial institutions would view this as a necessary, prudent retreat to prevent a sovereign debt crisis. Additionally, the urban middle class, who inherently benefit more from subsidized fuel for private vehicles than from public school meals, would implicitly favor this stabilization measure (Yuda & Ahmada, 2026).

Socio-political analysis reveals that this trade-off is fundamentally asymmetrical. The political fallout from Scenario A (hyperinflation and mass riots led by organized labor) represents an acute and immediate threat to regime stability. Conversely, the fallout from Scenario B (loss of political face and grassroots disillusionment) represents the chronic, long-term erosion of electoral hegemony (Hadiz, 2016). Because a populist regime prioritizes immediate political survival above all, the pure execution of either scenario was deemed unsurvivable. The state could not afford the instability of Scenario A or the political humiliation of Scenario B. It is precisely this paralyzing socio-political asymmetry that ultimately drove the administration toward the compromise of "silent dilution," strategically retaining the symbolic narrative of the MBG to appease the Patronage Coalition, while gutting its actual fiscal footprint to appease the Technocrats and fund the energy subsidies.

5. Conclusions

The operationalization of the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) mandate during the 2026 macroeconomic exigency provides a salient anatomical interrogation of the structural vulnerabilities inherent in welfare populism within emerging polities. This inquiry demonstrates that the collision between an immutable, capital-intensive populist promise and a precipitous exogenous shock, catalyzed by the dual crisis of escalating global crude prices and currency depreciation, precipitates a paralyzing fiscal squeeze. Constrained by the non-discretionary institutional barrier of the statutory 3% fiscal deficit ceiling, the sovereign was forced to navigate an asymmetrical political economy trilemma that fundamentally threatened the foundations of regime legitimacy.

The primary findings of this research elucidate that within a zero-sum fiscal environment, a regime predicated on populist legitimacy is unable to operationalize orthodox resolutions to a macroeconomic trilemma. Prioritizing the MBG through the abandonment of energy subsidies would have catalyzed a period of imported hyperinflation and mass social unrest, while the absolute deferment of the mandate would have precipitated a catastrophic collapse of the administration's electoral credibility. The strategic resolution to this exigency—conceptualized herein as a mechanism of "silent dilution"—highlights a critical survival mechanism of populist governance. By operationalizing geographic triage to restrict beneficiary targets, substituting high-cost nutritional benchmarks with inferior local alternatives, and decentralizing the fiscal burden to sub-national governments, the administration preserved the symbolic narrative of the mandate while effectively reducing its macroeconomic footprint and human-capital efficacy.

Theoretically, this inquiry shifts the analytical lens by demonstrating the profound fragility of welfare populism when subjected to volatile globalized commodity markets. Unlike rights-based welfare states anchored by

progressive tax architectures, populist mega-programs in the Global South are frequently situated on narrow, volatile discretionary budgets. Consequently, during periods of global supply chain fracture, these distributive interventions cease to function as resilient safety nets; instead, they metamorphose into structural liabilities that actively cannibalize the state's capacity for basic macroeconomic stabilization—specifically energy price security—thereby undermining the very grassroots demographics they were engineered to mobilize.

Moving forward, the 2026 exigency serves as a cautionary tale for the architecture of public policy in Indonesia. If the sovereign intends to transition from the volatile cycles of welfare populism toward the sustainable cognitive capital formation required for the "Golden Indonesia 2045" teleology, structural fiscal reform is absolute and non-discretionary. Capital-intensive social mandates cannot be sustained on the margins of a fiscal posture that is heavily exposed to global hydrocarbon benchmarks. Future policy architectures must explicitly decouple massive welfare interventions from the general APBN, anchoring them to dedicated, earmarked revenue streams, such as targeted wealth taxes. Furthermore, achieving genuine domestic food and energy sovereignty is no longer merely a nationalist aspiration; it has become a strict macroeconomic prerequisite for shielding domestic social policy from the severe vagaries of geopolitical instability.

Author Contributions: PS: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing.

Funding: The author declares that no funding was received for this research or its publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no competing financial or commercial interests related to this work.

Informed Consent Statement/Ethics approval: This study did not require ethical approval because it did not involve human participants, animal subjects, or sensitive data.

Data Availability Statement: All data supporting this study are contained within the article and supplementary materials. Additional inquiries can be addressed to the corresponding author.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies: The author confirms that no generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used for writing or preparing this manuscript.

References

- Askar, M. W., Muhammad, G. D., Fikri, B., & Darmawan, J. (2024). *Who Is Hungry, Who Is Full? Risk Mitigation in the Free Nutritious Meal Program* (CELIOS Policy Brief). Center of Economic and Law Studies (CELIOS). <https://celios.co.id/who-is-hungry-who-is-full-risk-mitigation-in-the-free-nutritious-meal-program/>
- Aspinall, E. (2013). A NATION IN FRAGMENTS: Patronage and Neoliberalism in Contemporary Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 45(1), 27–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2013.758820>
- Aspinall, E., & Berenschot, W. (2019). *Democracy for Sale: Elections, Clientelism, and the State in Indonesia* (Vol. 1). Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501732997>
- Badan Gizi Nasional. (2025a). *General Guidelines for the System and Governance of the National Nutrition Agency for the Free Nutritious Meal Program* (Pedoman Umum Sistem Dan Tata Kelola Badan Gizi Nasional Untuk Program Makan Bergizi Gratis). Badan Gizi Nasional.
- Badan Gizi Nasional. (2025b). *Guidelines for Food Distribution and Nutrition Education in the Free Nutritious Meal Program for Pregnant Women, Breastfeeding Mothers, and Non-ECCD Toddlers* (Pedoman Distribusi Makanan Dan Edukasi Gizi Pada Program Makan Bergizi Gratis Bagi Ibu Hamil, Ibu Menyusui Dan Anak Balita Non-Paud). Badan Gizi Nasional.
- Badan Pangan Nasional. (2025). *Acceleration of the MBG Program in 3T Areas, Government Encourages the Use of Local Food*. Badan Pangan Nasional. <https://badanpangan.go.id/blog/post/percepatan-program-mbg-di-daerah-3t-pemerintah-dorong-pemanfaatan-pangan-lokal>

- Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2025, May 5). *Bappenas Prepares the 2026 Government Work Plan as a Foundation for Economic Transformation Toward Golden Indonesia 2045*. <https://www.bappenas.go.id/berita/bappenas-susun-rkp-2026-sebagai-fondasi-transformasi-ekonomi-menuju-indonesia-emas-2045-rgej3>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2026, March 2). Year-on-Year (YoY) Inflation in February 2026 Was 4.76 Percent. *Berita Resmi Statistik*. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/pressrelease/2026/03/02/2551/inflasi-year-on-year--y-on-y--pada-februari-2026-sebesar-4-76-persen-.html>
- Bank Indonesia. (2026). *Monetary Policy Review: March 2026* (Monetary Policy Review). Bank Indonesia. <https://www.bi.go.id/id/publikasi/laporan/Pages/TKM-Maret-2026.aspx>
- Basri, M. C. (2025, October 31). *Indonesia's Fragile Middle Class*. Carnegie Endowment. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/10/indonesias-fragile-middle-class?lang=en>
- Centre for Strategic and International Studies. (2025, February 25). *Budget Efficiency and the Formation of Danantara: Economic Opportunity or Fiscal Challenge*. Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). <https://www.csis.or.id/news/efisiensi-anggaran-dan-pembentukan-danantara-peluang-ekonomi-atau-tantangan-fiskal/>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed). SAGE Publications.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2016). *Islamic Populism in Indonesia and the Middle East* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316402382>
- Haggard, S., & Kaufman, R. R. (2008). *Development, democracy and welfare states: Latin America, East Asia, and Eastern Europe*. Princeton Univ. Press.
- Heller, P. S. (2005). *Fiscal Space: What It Is and How to Get It* (IMF Policy Discussion Paper). International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org>
- Hood, C., & Dixon, R. (2015). *A government that worked better and cost less? Evaluating three decades of reform and change in UK central government* (First Edition). Oxford University Press.
- Institute for Development of Economics and Finance. (2024). *The Multiplier Effect of the Free Nutritional Meal Program*. Institute for Development of Economics and Finance (INDEF).
- Institute for Development of Economics and Finance. (2026). *Fiscal Deficit on the Edge: Brief Update—February 2026* (Fiscal Deficit on the Edge: Brief Update - February 2026). Institute for Development of Economics and Finance (INDEF).
- Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. (2025). *KPK Participates in Overseeing the Free Nutritious Meal Program, Warns of Potential Fraud and Encourages Transparency*. Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK). <https://kpk.go.id/id/ruang-informasi/berita/kpk-ikut-awasi-program-makan-bergizi-gratis-ingatkan-potensi-fraud-dan-dorong-transparansi>
- Mares, I., & Carnes, M. E. (2009). Social Policy in Developing Countries. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12(1), 93–113. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.12.071207.093504>
- Mietzner, M. (2020). Populist Anti-Scientism, Religious Polarisation, and Institutionalised Corruption. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 39(2), 227–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103420935561>
- Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia. (2024). *Financial Note and State Budget of Indonesia for Fiscal Year 2025* (State Budget Financial Report). Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia. (2025). *Financial Note and Draft State Revenue and Expenditure Budget for Fiscal Year 2026* (Buku II Nota Keuangan Beserta Rancangan Anggaran Pendapatan Dan Belanja Negara Tahun Anggaran 2026). Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 83 of 2024 on the National Nutrition Agency*.
- Smith, L. C., & Haddad, L. (2015). Reducing Child Undernutrition: Past Drivers and Priorities for the Post-MDG Era. *World Development*, 68, 180–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.11.014>
- Suprpto, F. A., Praditya, E., Dewi, R. M., & Adiyoso, W. (2025). A Policy Implementation Review of the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) Program. *The Journal of Indonesia Sustainable Development Planning*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.46456/jisdep.v6i2.798>
- Tuttle, R., Charleston, C., Hunter, A., & Longley, A. (2026, April 11). *The Oil Market Is in the Grip of a Panicked Race for Barrels*. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2026-04-11/the-oil-market-is-in-the-grip-of-a-panicked-race-for-barrels>
- UNICEF Indonesia. (n.d.). *Nutrition: Tackling the “triple burden” of malnutrition in Indonesia*. UNICEF Indonesia. Retrieved <https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/nutrition>
- Warburton, E. (2018). A New Developmentalism in Indonesia? *Southeast Asian Economies*, 35(3), 355–368. <https://doi.org/10.1355/ae35-3c>
- Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics. *Comparative Politics*, 34(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.2307/422412>
- World Bank. (2025). *Indonesia Economic Prospects, December 2025: Digital Foundations for Growth*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/44078>

- World Bank. (2026). *Industrial Policy in the Digital Age*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-2327-5>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (Sixth edition). SAGE.
- Yuda, T. K., & Ahmada, S. F. (2026). The Welfare State in Indonesia. In C. Aspalter (Ed.), *The East Asian Welfare Model: Evaluating Welfare Politics and Outcomes from an Ideal-Typical Perspective* (pp. 265–289). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-6809-3_13