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INTRODUCTION:

- **Purpose:** Consider Food Security and implications on self-sufficiency and other concerns (implicit emphasis on rice) – in the wake of key changes and new dimensions related to Food Security.

- **Underlying theme:** It is prudent to recognise the new dimensions in Food Security, the interplay and linkages of these new dimensions with increasing importance of cross border solutions/opportunities involving Public-Private Partnership so as to be able to ‘get the basics and balance right’ in line with the PPA 2009 Theme of ‘Transforming the Nation: Constructing the Future, Investing in Prosperity’.
FOOD PRICE PROTESTS AND RIOTS FROM JANUARY 2007 TO MAY 2008

Source: USAID, Office of Food for Peace
FOOD CRISIS AND FOOD SECURITY: LESSONS

- **New Dimensions** as compared to earlier Food Crises – Food-Feed-Fuel-Finance conundrum

- **SHORTAGE?** Crisis in many countries not about Shortage, but of Prices. Many instances ‘shortage’ – due to greed, hoarding, misinformation (i.e. ‘man-made’) leading to imbalance of supply and demand – Gandhian: ‘enough for everyone’s need BUT not everyone’s greed’!

- **PRICES?** – international prices have retreated from peak to stabilise at new equilibrium but higher than before – End of era of ‘cheap food’. And future supply systems more uncertain – requiring innovative approaches at national and regional levels

- **Importance of management of Supply Chains & Trading Networks in mitigating impact in Turbulent Times** – Importance of Private-Public Partnerships - Much depends on how well supply chains and international networks are managed (or mismanaged?).
FOOD CRISIS AND FOOD SECURITY (contd..)

- BLESSING – Opportunity to transform individual countries’ Food/Rice Industry – strategic investments along supply chain (BUT many cases derailed by subsequent Financial Crisis)

- BUT – Need for Vigilance and Monitoring and ability to Respond as a Nation/Region - cross-border arrangements getting more important – role of Private sector/investment/driver – quicker response – Adam Smith’s ‘Invisible Hand’

- While major initiatives are targeted at fixing Supply side, efforts should also focus on conditioning or managing the Demand side as well

- Need to get the Basics & Balance Right
WAKE UP CALL?

“For anyone concerned about the future of food, this is an indispensable book.”
—Michael Pollan

THE END OF FOOD
Paul Roberts

The Economist
Why you should still be scared of lentils
The world's best and worst schools
Developing your genes
The beginning of the end for cheats
Our books of the year

THE END OF CHEAP FOOD
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UNDERSTAND WHAT FOOD SECURITY REALLY MEANS

- Food Security, like love means different things to different people under different circumstances
- Maxwell’s review (1996) : encountered 32 different definitions!

“…When all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life”

Source: FAO, 2004
DECIDE WHICH ASPECTS OF THE FOOD SECURITY CHALLENGE MERIT MOST ATTENTION/INVESTMENT:

- **Availability** => overall ability of the agricultural system to meet food demand
- **Access** => by individuals to adequate resources (entitlements) to acquire appropriate foods for a nutritious diet
- **Utilization** => safety, quality and nutritional aspects of food products
- **Stability** => individuals at high risk of temporarily or permanently losing their access to the resources needed to consume adequate food

Source: FAO, 2004
If food availability is the priority, relevant means include:

- Increase imports
- Restrict exports
- Grow your own offshore
- Expand area
- Raise farm productivity
- Reduce post-harvest losses

If access to food important, consider other thrusts/means:

- Reinforce free trade
- Targeted feeding programs
- Give in-kind food aid
- Provide cash transfers, coupons, etc
- Manipulate prices
- Improve logistics

Source: Lamb, 2009
If better food utilization is the priority, other options are:

- Develop new products
- Fortify existing products
- Improve diets
- Train foodservice operators
- Educate consumers

if enhanced food stability is the priority, thrusts/means are:

- Use crop or weather insurance
- Develop more tolerant varieties
- Enhance transit and shelf life
- Create physical reserves
- Establish warehouse receipts program
- Create virtual stockpiles

Source: Lamb, 2009
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES RESPONDED TO HIGHER PRICES WITH DIFFERENT POLICIES AND PROGRAMS, SOME DISTORTIONARY

Figure 2: Developing countries responded to higher prices with price policies, stock releases, export restrictions and social protection programs

- Reduced taxes on food grains
- Increased supply using food grain stocks
- Restricted exports
- Controlled prices / consumer subsidies
- Cash transfer
- Food for work
- Food ration/stamps
- School feeding

STRATEGIC APPROACH TO FOOD SECURITY

Some countries, including Malaysia, which have cushioned the impact – have invariably adopted a pragmatic Strategic Approach linking:

- **Food Security** (focused on rice – basic staple, ‘political’ crop); and
- **Economic Growth** (growth with redistribution)

at both the ‘macro’ and ‘micro’ levels.

- **Macro-level**: leverage policy control over:
  - Sectoral composition of income growth
  - Food prices - stabilisation
- **Micro-level**: rural development
  - Rural education/HRD – accessible to poor and females
  - Rural clinics – healthcare, family planning
  - Home economics, nutrition education
STRATEGIC APPROACH TO FOOD SECURITY

Strategic Approach comprises 3 components:

- **Rapid growth** in macro economy;
- **Poverty eradication** through rural economic growth ('pro-poor’ growth); and
- **Stability** of food system.

A MACRO PERSPECTIVE OF THE DETERMINANTS OF FOOD SECURITY:

Three “virtuous circles” of activity, held together by agriculture and the rural economy


...over the next few decades, the global food system will come under renewed pressure from the combined effects of seven fundamental factors:

- Population Growth
- Nutrition Transition
- Energy
- Land
- Water
- Labour
- Climate Change
They further posited that:

- ‘Business as usual’ models would at worst fail, at best poor preparation for future scenario;
- Food supply arrangements must operate profitably around significantly higher price norm (reflecting true cost of resources & incorporating wider social and ecological considerations);
- Supply systems going to be more uncertain and prices more volatile
- Able to reconcile often conflicting goals of resilience, sustainability and competitiveness while meeting and managing consumer expectations; and
- New capacities, policy framework and institutions are cornerstones
Future Supply Systems

- capable of shaping and responding to consumer preferences in line with social needs
- capable of delivering affordable food around a potentially higher baseline of costs
- able to assure longer term availability despite increasing global uncertainties
- able to supply safe, healthy food with positive social benefits and low environmental impacts

Ambler-Edwards et al. (2009)
This is an indicative interpretation of the UK supply network. Waste figures based on work undertaken by the Food Process innovation Unit at Cardiff University on behalf of the Food Chain Centre. WRAP estimates have been used for consumer waste figures. Available online at:

TRANSITION FROM OLD TO NEW GOALS

Resilience

OLD  
Managing shocks

NEW  
Assuring longer-term supply in light of increased uncertainties

Managing Consumer Expectations

OLD  
Convenience and choice at least cost

NEW  
Healthy food with low environmental impacts

Sustainability

OLD  
Safe, low-cost food with conscience

NEW  
Provision of safe, healthy food with positive social benefits and low environmental impacts

Competitiveness

OLD  
Affordable value-adding products through cost-effective processes

NEW  
Affordable, value-adding products through effective use of all resources
NEW DIMENSION IN FOOD SECURITY - TRACEABILITY

- A ‘new dimension’ of Food Security, especially in US, EU and other developed nations – *traceability* - however, somewhat blurred by concerns over Food- Financial Crises in 2008 – refers to *supply protection* rather to *supply insufficiency* – ‘that what one eats is safe and traceable’ – from ‘farm to fork’

- Traceability (ISO Definition) – The *ability to trace* the history, application or location of an entity by means of recorded information
  - *In the food chain* – The ability to trace and follow a food, feed, food producing animal or substance through all stages of production and distribution
  - *In production systems* – The ability to trace the history of the product through the supply chain to or from the place and time of production, including the identification of inputs used and production operations undertaken
TRACEABILITY (CONT’D)

- Generally categorised into fresh produce (fruits, vegetables), grains and oilseeds, and livestock and fish as well as their processed forms.

- Heightened after 9/11 and series of food scares – BSE, Avian Flu (H5N1), Nipah virus, Foot & Mouth Disease, bio-terrorism, contaminated seafood, pet food – more recent Toxic infant formula/milk and biscuits, etc tainted with melamine – impact on entire supply chain.

- Compliance and beyond - business angle (first mover advantage, branding, product differentiation) – Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’
NEW DIMENSION: REGIONAL SOLUTIONS/EFFORTS

- Recent global food crisis – recognition that food security one of most important cross-border issues where countries acting alone are unable to handle – top priority issue in ASEAN and East Asia (ASEAN+3) levels – Malaysia key player in BOTH

- In 14th ASEAN Summit, March 2009, Thailand – adopted ASEAN Integrated Food Security Framework (AIFSF) and Strategic Plan of Action on Food Security in the ASEAN Region (SPA-FS)

- In 11th ASEAN+3 Summit, Nov 2007 – identified food security issues as the key area where regional cooperation need to be advanced. NEAT Working Group in East Asian Food Security, July 2009 – need to build on East Asia Emergency Rice Reserve (EAERR) piloted in 2004 [Japan earmarked 250,000MT of rice, recently China pledged 300,000MT – cf ASEAN Emergency Rice Reserve of 87,000MT] and ASEAN Food Security Information System (AFSIS) initiated in 2003 and weave into AIFSF and SPA-FS

IMPLICATIONS ON FOOD SELF-SUFFICIENCY

‘Food Self-sufficiency’ – given Malaysia’s enviable position (small open economy) more relevant to focus on ‘Food Self-reliance’ in the wake of New Dimensions of Food Security and regional initiatives.

Malaysia: small open economy but:

- IMD World Competitiveness Scoreboard – 19th in 2008
- A.T Kearny/FOREIGN POLICY Globalisation Index – 19th in 2006
- Healthy Trade Surplus (Balance of Trade) – > RM100 billion per annum over 2006(108 billion) - 2008(141 billion) period

So given the absolute quantum of the types of food demanded, our extensive trade links, excellent International relations, and healthy trade surplus, we do not envisage serious problems in sourcing – comfortably ‘food self-reliant’. Rightfully, we have elected to remain net importer for rice and other food items.
## SELF-SUFFICIENCY LEVELS IN FOOD COMMODITIES, 2000-2010 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Revised 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ninth Malaysia Plan (9MP) & MTR 9MP
### IMPLICATIONS: RISING FOOD IMPORT BILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Rising Food import Bill’ (RM Billion)</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Imports</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>23.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Exports</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Imports</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOAAI

2007 - deficit of **RM9.6 billion** in Malaysia’s Food Import Bill – often stressed

My take, given our Balance of Trade of **RM100.34** in 2007, this deficit works out to **9.6%** of overall trade surplus.

More importantly, **definitional ‘quirk’** - palm oil and palm oil products exports in 2006-2008 were **RM22.7 billion, RM33.2 billion and RM47.9 billion** (>7% of total exports). If ‘Oils & Fats’ included as food component (as per classification by both FAO and World Bank), **totally different picture** – **MALAYSIA IS A NET EXPORTER OF FOOD** (traditionally defined) – YET some quarters persist in highlighting ‘rising food import bill’... WHY?
FAO’s FOOD PRICE INDICES by Categories

N.B. World Bank’s Classification – Oils & Fats, Cereals, and Other Food (meat, sugar, beverages, etc)
WORLD FOOD CRISIS: GAINERS & LOSERS

2007 - 2008 IMPACT OF PROJECTED FOOD PRICE INCREASES ON TRADE BALANCES

- Large losers (trade balance worsening > 1% 2005 GDP)
- Moderate losers (trade balance worsening < 1% 2005 GDP)
- Moderate gainers (trade balance improving < 1% 2005 GDP)
- Large gainers (trade balance improving > 1% 2005 GDP)
- No data

SOURCE: USDA
THE CASE OF RICE: GLOBAL – Changing Situation and Trade Pattern

**Figure 1: Changing Import Structure**

- ...28% to Africa
- ...17% to Middle East
- ...28% to Asia

**Figure 2: Changing Export Structure**

- Six major exporting countries account for 86% of world exports.

**World Cereal Prices (normal scale)**

- Jan 04 - May 09

**Source:** Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

**Source:** IMF (2008b). Data are deflated by the US GDP deflator.
GLOBAL – World Food Crisis in Retrospect

Monthly World Rice Prices for Various Types of Rice

Monthly Imported Price by Rice Types, 2006-2008

Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) Malaysia
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## Figure 7: Spatial & Temporal - Summary of Harvesting Periods

Selected Rice Exporting Countries – Availability every month of year!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBAL – Food Security
MALAYSIAN RICE SECTOR IN PERSPECTIVE

- Area under rice – 415,000 ha (>50% double cropped) Vs >4 million ha under oil palm, 1.2 million ha under rubber - Comparative advantage in tree crops (no deltas or wide alluvial plains)
- Contribution to GDP <1% (0.7% in 1988, 0.2% in 2006)
- No. of farm families – 155,990; Av yield – 3.43 MT/ha
- Av age of farmers – 60 (48% > 60, 5.6% < 40)
- Annual imports 400K to 800K MT (<3% of globally traded rice)
- Always elected to be net importer (60 to 90% SSL)
- Disproportionate intervention/support – ‘political crop’- more interventionist after recent food crisis
- Production-centric, Peninsular Malaysia-centric, & overt reliance on subsidies
GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION AND CORNERSTONE OF MALAYSIAN RICE POLICY

Rice Policy – Historical Perspective:

- **3 main objectives** – ensuring **food security**; raising farm income & **productivity**; ensuring rice supply at fair & stable prices
- **LPN** established 1972, sole importer in 1973, corporatised as Bernas in 1994, privatised BERNAS in 1996 (market liberalisation), listed KLSE in 1997 – sole-importer status retained until January 2011, in return for performing set of ‘duties’ & ‘social obligations’ as per **Privatisation Agreement**
- **Production-centric** & balancing producers’ and consumers’ interests
MALAYSIA’S RESPONSE TO FOOD CRISIS:

- **Comprehensive Package** to keep rice prices low, supplies high, and ensure better prices to farmers:
  - Assure supply of **subsidised** control grade ST 15% (RM1.80/kg) nationwide [subsequent subsidy to millers, including BERNAS, @RM800/MT to produce ST15%]
  - **Capping** of other local rice prices, ST 5% and ST 10%
  - **Floating** of imported rice prices
  - Increase in **GMP** of padi from RM650 to RM750/MT
  - Gradual removal of interstate movement of padi
  - Increase on the **National stockpile** from 92,000MT to 239,000MT

- **National Food Security Policy, 2008**
  - Increased investment in paddy/rice, fisheries, livestock and vegetables
  - Diesel subsidy to fishermen
  - New paddy areas (rice bowls) in Sabah and Sarawak
  - Comprehensive (excessive?) package for rice
## PADI AND RICE PRODUCTION PROGRAMMES IN THE NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY POLICY, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Irrigation Infrastructure And Drainage Development</td>
<td>97.50</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Irrigation Infrastructure And Drainage Maintenance</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land Levelling</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Additional NPK Fertilizer</td>
<td>209.70</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pest Control Aid</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>173.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lime Application</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Farm Mechanization</td>
<td>96.10</td>
<td>186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Incentive and Subsidy</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>133.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sabah and Sarawak Rice Subsidy</td>
<td>406.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Miller Subsidy</td>
<td>300.80</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stockpiling</td>
<td>480.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,954.95</td>
<td>2,228.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*excluding on-going paddy price subsidy (458.1 mil in 2008) and fertilizer subsidy programmes*
According to FAO (2008), about 10% of production increase will come from area expansion from current level of 3.75 billion hectares.

Maybe 20% will come from intensification.

Remaining 70% must come from R&D, innovation, and policies.

10-20-70 rule

Also recent econometrics studies have indicated that yield response elasticity for padi price is significantly higher than those for production subsidies (especially for fertilisers) in Malaysia.
WHAT ELSE NEEDED?

- ‘Get the Balance Right’ – no one group gets everything it wants, sacrifices necessary but temporary – to accommodate new dimensions – also balance state, national and regional efforts

- Immediate, mid-term, longer-term efforts
  - Supply-side – supply response to price, exploit biotechnology & innovation, infrastructure, rationalise/repackage subsidies, public-private partnerships – along entire supply chain
  - Demand-side – reduce demand (reduce wastage, consumption, diversify diet - supplement with other staples/carbohydrates (e.g. Vitato) – also eat < meat & switch from terrestrial livestock to seafood/aquaculture (more efficient feed conversion ratio)
  - Strengthen & orchestrate rice supply chains and international networks – encourage competition, move on from single-desk trading in rice (Malaysia – odd man out in ASEAN)
CONCLUSION:

- Guardedly optimistic of Malaysia’s ability to harness and exploit opportunities in relation to the dynamic changes in Food Security. However, the increasing need is to “get the basics and balance right”. The dynamic interplay between the various drivers of development of supply chains and international webs/networks, strategy for future food systems and evolving innovative developments/ideas can and should be harnessed to generate wealth, income and stability and hence ensure food security at the local, national, and regional levels.

- A key challenge is continuously address the Fundamentals of population growth, the nutrition transition, energy, land, water, labour, and climate change as well as emerging trends, new ideas and innovations.
Another challenge is to mount multidisciplinary empirical studies to better understand the interplay and impacts and guide policy so that future development and progress can be more balanced and sustainable.

Lastly, to end with a touch of Zen, this paper merely acts as a ‘finger pointing to the moon’. As always, the usefulness of the finger is in pointing away from itself to the light which illuminates finger and all.
THANK YOU!

larry@isis.org.my

www.isis.org.my