

Impacts of Platform Capitalism on Community Activism in Indonesia

RAYMOND GRENFELL

Curtin University

AGUNG WARDANA

Universitas Gadjah Mada

ABSTRACT

Indonesian community activism, as manifest in the collective house phenomena and social movements, has historically been connected to radical community media or *media komunitas*, media controlled and created by grassroots activists and artists. But as Indonesia, one of Southeast Asia's greatest users of corporate social media in South-East Asia, activists and artists are beginning to rely more on platform capitalism and corporate social media platforms as a tool for social organising. While it is argued that this has had some benefits, especially during the Covid19 pandemic in which physical contact has been greatly restricted, there are emerging issues and concerns around anonymity, surveillance, control of content and state repression. This article reviews literature platform capitalism and Indonesian community activism on interviews in June 2020 with members of the Ruang MES56 and KUNCI collective houses in Yogyakarta. Furthermore, it reflects on the second author's own experiences on the use of platform capitalism in the social movements against the controversial Indonesian Omnibus Law. This article describes issues and concerns expressed by participants and more broadly with the use of platform capitalism as a tool for social organisation in Indonesia doing so it questions to what extent contemporary activists and artists should rely on such platforms to achieve their goals. Finally, reflecting on the findings from the study and pertinent literature, this article examines some of the reasons why platform capitalism is not an adequate substitute for physical space in Indonesia.

Keywords: collective houses, community activism, Omnibus Law, platform capitalism

INTRODUCTION

The role of community and alternative media (self-publishing in print, radio and other independent media) in movements for social change is well documented (Lievrouw 2011). Research in this area is often framed as ‘communication for social change,’ which means the use of media in effecting social, cultural and political change within social movements, most often in the global south (Servaes 2008; Unwin 2017). While this study fits within this context, it more specifically addresses how activists, artists, and autonomists use media as a means to further their internal organisational structures, especially those that are attempting to build alternative, prefigurative models of social organisation. Specifically, this study investigates the use of platform capitalism by two collective houses in Yogyakarta, which are communally-run housing projects in Indonesia that provide space for the realisation of political, social, and cultural projects (Arbuckle 2007; Grenfell 2020; Keller 2012), as well as activists engaged in social movements challenging the Omnibus Law. The article explores why the use of these platforms may not be considered adequate substitutions for physical organising within these communities and movements. Therefore, this study seeks to contribute to theories of media democratization within a media studies framework, especially in relation to the role of new digital media as potential tools for democratization (Vaidhyanathan 2004; Castells 2012; Dijck and Hacker 2000). Furthermore, given the ubiquitous use of corporate social media in Indonesia (Greenhouse 2019), this study seeks to investigate the impacts of platform capitalism on the everyday sociality of Indonesians. While acknowledging the role platform capitalism can serve in the facilitation of everyday sociality and social organisation, this study primarily serves as a critique of the use of platform capitalism as a substitute for physical organisation and space.

Indonesian civil society has a long history of utilising community media as a means of organising alternative spaces, collectives, and social movements (Jurriens 2013). This has been demonstrated in the collective house phenomena in Yogyakarta – intentional spaces that experiment with new forms of social organisation and develop social relationships through community struggle (Keller 2012; Arbuckle 2007). However, in recent decades many Indonesians engaged in such political or cultural projects and movements have shifted away from traditional community media toward digital media platforms, such as WhatsApp and Facebook. These digital platforms and the ‘ecosystem of connective media’ in which they exist are defined as “platform capitalism” (Dijck 2013, 165). The advent of platform capitalism has instigated a significant shift in social and cultural activity by not only changing the nature of media and communication but also transforming social relationships (Dijck 2013; Srnicek 2016).

The recent Covid19 pandemic has meant a further reliance on these digital platforms as activists and others attempt to overcome restrictions to their sociality. While arguably these platforms have been useful for activists and artists in finding creative ways to organise – especially in the context of

restrictions imposed under the pandemic – the reliance on such platforms has not come without problems of censorship, surveillance, and control (Dijick 2013; Lim 2014; Morozov 2009). This article explores the impacts and implications of platform capitalism on two collective houses in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, and discusses some of the impacts of platform capitalism on the social movements mobilised in opposition to Indonesia's controversial 2020 Omnibus Law.

SCOPE AND METHOD

The scope of this study includes excerpts from workshops conducted remotely in Yogyakarta with members of the Ruang MES56 and KUNCI collectives in June 2020. Eight individuals participated in these workshops that culminated in the production of two radio podcasts. Invitation to the workshops was open to all members of both collectives, however, given the COVID-19 pandemic, attendance was limited by people's health and safety precautions. While the workshop designs allowed for open discussion and participation, the workshops were directed by semi-formal interview questions. These interview questions were designed to thematically elicit engagement and to promote positive interaction with a wider audience (Kvale 2007, 58). This workshop design was informed by the first author's engagement with independent media activists in Australia and Indonesia. Drawing from Chang's (2013, 108) method of auto-ethnography, the second author's experience and involvement with the Indonesian environmental movements from 2005 until present were also integrated in the discussion of results (Chang 2013, 108). This auto-ethnographic component is in part a reflection on the author's own experience, having spent sixteen years involved in these movements. Auto-ethnography is an increasingly effective approach for academics researching social movements. For example, Fuchs (2014) embedded himself within the Occupy Wall Street movement, researching the challenges connected to the use of platform capitalism by the activists involved in the demonstrations. While this approach can be limited by the subjectivity of the author/s, the addition of semi-structured interviews as qualitative research in this study can be used to test, challenge or confirm the author/s own direct experience.

FROM COMMUNITY MEDIA TO PLATFORM CAPITALISM

The development of Web 2.0 and the subsequent advent of social media in the early 2000s transformed not only new digital media but also our cultural and social connectivity. Dijick (2013) and Srnicek (2016) define this shift of social and cultural activity as an emergence of "platform capitalism." Dijick (2013) argues that while early proponents of Web 2.0 promised greater egalitarian sociality and connectivity through a more participatory Internet, the dominance of large corporates meant that the traditional stratified media model has been largely reproduced. Social media's automation of content

through algorithms, data mining, marketing, and control of access to information has established what Dijck (2013) describes as an “ecosystem of connective media” (Dijck, 165), i.e., platform capitalism. Significantly, however, there is an emerging dynamic between the function and maintenance of physical or civic spaces and platform capitalism (Lim 2012; 2014). This is of particular relevance to autonomists who historically have found their meaning, purpose, and identity within physical space (Ardizzoni 2013).

Neoliberalism and the subsequent privatization of physical space has meant a steep decline in civic spaces i.e., sporting clubs, trade unions, public squares, religious organisations, and other spaces that traditionally, in times of crisis, would be used as hubs of social organising and change (Lim 2014). This decline has led to platform capitalism, filling the void of maintaining everyday sociality. But given the corporate nature of social media, such platforms may be a problematic substitute for civic space (Dijck 2013; Lim 2014).

Indonesia is one of the bigger users of platforms such as WhatsApp and Facebook with approximately 150 million Indonesians accessing corporate social media, roughly fifty-six percent of the population, with a daily access time of over three hours per user (Greenhouse, 2019). It is therefore not surprising that many of those involved in collective houses and social movements in Indonesia have, to some extent, begun to rely on platform capitalism. One example for this is the movement against the Benoa Bay Reclamation in Bali, organised by ForBali in which the opponent groups have used platforms such as Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook to circulate posters, videos, and messages for mobilising youth in joining the movement (Wardana 2019). In addition, the Ekspedisi Indonesia Biru (Blue Indonesia Expedition) by WatchdoC has heavily relied on eco-documentary movies disseminated on a YouTube channel to expose environmental destructions across the archipelago. Through this channel, the most-seen film, *Sexy Killers* (Indonesia 2019), an examination of the dirty business of the coal industry in the country (owned by major political elites), has reached more than 35 million viewers since April 2019 (YouTube 2020).

INDONESIAN COMMUNITY MEDIA, ACTIVISM AND COLLECTIVE HOUSES

Historically, community activism in Indonesia has been closely tied to community media or “media komunitas” which is described as a media platform that is “from, by and for the people” (Jurriens 2013). Media komunitas sought to be a truly independent and autonomist media production that did not seek support or permission from the state in the production of its social and cultural activities (Jurriens 2013). The focus of this media was on encouraging the participation of ordinary people rather than professionals. In doing so, media komunitas was a form of alternative media that attempted to

“deprofessionalise,” “decapitalise,” and “deinstitutionalise” media production (Atton 2002). Organisations such as The Institute of People’s Culture (Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat, aka LEKRA) laid the foundation of this kind of radical community media, contributing significantly to political and social movements from 1950 to 1965 (Foulcher 1986; Jurriens 2013). Through a diverse output of media, from visual arts to literature and theatre, LEKRA, which was informally linked to the Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia, aka PKI), created radical participatory networks of urbanised and rural artists. These kinds of participatory networks were eventually outlawed by Suharto in 1967 when the dictatorship took hold of Indonesia (Roosa 2006; Jurriens 2013).

Amidst the rise of nationalism and neoliberalism under the Suharto regime in Indonesia in the 1970s and 1980s, contemporary Indonesian art emerged as a reflection on and challenge to the rampant Western industrialist capitalism that swept across the country (Supangkat 2005). In the 1990s, rapid commercialisation and a newfound internationalism, combined with political challenges to the long-established oligarchies, saw the re-emergence of community media and the creation of collective houses throughout Indonesia.

The collective houses serve as a space for artistic, social, and political organising, often with an emphasis on grassroots democratic organising. For example, the collective house Ruang MES56, based in Yogyakarta, was founded by students involved in the ‘reformasi’ demonstrations, the wave of protests and riots in Indonesia that resulted in the resignation of Suharto in 1998 (Grenfell 2020). While the founders of MES56 themselves are not necessarily radicals, the models they have adopted to organise can be considered prefigurative and autonomist in that they focus on creating more democratic and independent structures than what they perceive to be available in contemporary Indonesian society (Grenfell 2020).

Perhaps the most infamous collective house in Yogyakarta is Taring Padi, a revolutionary art group formed in 1998. Taring Padi members deliberately combined their activism with original artwork, using music, poetry, visual arts, and sculpture to organise local, national and even international communities to take action on issues of social, economic, and environmental justice (Arbuckle 2007; Keller 2012). Significantly, the physical space of the collective house acted as an inclusive community space in which the individual activists and artists realised their projects and utopian ideals.

From the time Taring Padi occupied the building, it became a stronghold for progressive and revolutionary activities; the house’s lecture rooms were used by Taring Padi to facilitate gatherings and exhibitions, as well as “borrowed” by other progressive groups for discussions, concerts, and performances. In addition, Taring Padi encouraged the participation of local residents. Taring Padi members gave drawing lessons to neighbourhood children, and held ‘Full Moon’ culture night

activities where local residents were invited to perform music and recite poetry.
(Taring Padi 2021)

The collective house has strong connections to Javanese culture, especially communal ceremonial traditions (Herminingrum 2015). However, modernisation and the rapid growth of platform capitalism have brought significant challenges to collective houses as Indonesian ideas of space and community change.

MES56 AND KUNCI: EFFECTS OF PLATFORM CAPITALISM

Ruang MES56 is situated in the middle of Yogyakarta, wedged between mosques, shopping malls and endless road vendors. To access the space, you walk down an old alleyway behind a massage parlour and through a large rusted gate. Often you will be greeted by members sitting in the open courtyard, while others would be coming and going from the studios or listening to music in the record store. At night time, the space becomes a hive of activity, being one of the few local spaces to serve alcohol. Young people and artists from the area converge on the space to drink, talk, and perform. Founded in the 1990s, initially, the intention was to create an independent space for emerging photographers, however, over the years MES56 has attracted a diversity of artists and activists, holding mixed media exhibitions and events (Grenfell 2020).

A five-minute scooter ride away from MES56 is another collective house: KUNCI. Unlike MES56, KUNCI is a space that maintains a more closed collective. The collective house focuses on community, political and cultural education. Initially formed as a cultural studies group, KUNCI experiments with methods of producing and sharing collective knowledge (KUNCI n.d.). Space incorporates a "radical library;" and regularly hosts info-sessions on a diversity of subjects, including workshops on a range of educational subjects such as permaculture or feminism. Unlike MES56, the majority of the members of KUNCI are younger, few speak English, and beyond the info-sessions there are limited public events.

Neither MES56 or KUNCI can be compared to collectives such as the famous activist-oriented Taring Pardi, nor are they objectively revolutionary in their intentions. However, both KUNCI and MES56 members believe in the importance of collective houses in creating physical space for independent thought and action, whether that be political or artistic. In this sense, both collective houses can be considered autonomist, as Wimo, one of the members of MES56, commented:

I prefer to ignore the existence of government... Because without government we already have a lot of bad people, like big museums or big collectors, they ruin our lives

also without government. So I think it is important to talk to your friends and start to build a more sustainable economy. (MES56 member Wimo 2020)

The members of MES56 and KUNCI have a conflicted relationship with platform capitalism, one that has become ever more complicated during the COVID-19 pandemic. Both collectives use WhatsApp messenger to coordinate the running of their spaces, as well as to work on online and offline projects. In fact, many members only started using platforms when they joined their respective collectives, as Dito from MES56 explained:

I remember how I first got WhatsApp. It's because everything, all the information that is shared between the members of the collective, was only shared through the WhatsApp group and during that time I didn't use it. But after that, I slowly used it more often and now it's more like a source of information for me. (MES56 member Dito 2020)

The pandemic meant that regular meetings, workshops, exhibitions, and other activities at MES56 were made impossible. While platforms such as WhatsApp allowed the members to stay in touch, many members did not believe this was a sufficient alternative. Issues such as surveillance, control of content, and anonymity are of concern for many of the members of MES56. Many have direct experience with state repression or censorship or simply wish to maintain the independence of their artworks, identity, and social space. However, fundamentally, they felt that online platforms were not a good substitute as they need physical space for their cultural and community connectivity, as Akiq from MES56 explained:

I think that the physical space or face to face meeting is like a part of the model of our collective. It's really, really important.... We now try to use more online interaction, especially during this pandemic, but without the physical space it is really hard to maintain the integrity, the feeling for each other. It is really difficult to maintain this. (MES56 member Akiq 2020)

These growing concerns with platform capitalism as a substitute for physical space and relationships is echoed by members of KUNCI. While being a smaller collective with less focus on public events, the collective is also increasingly reliant on platforms for event organisation. Like MES56, members of KUNCI use WhatsApp to organise their collective and have also started producing podcasts but they are increasingly worried about the impacts that this is having on both the space and their relationships. Ficky, one of the members of KUNCI, commented during the workshops:

Physical space gives you more grounding to social relationships. It gives you a base to understand how small talks can bring different points of view but physical space is also not to be seen as a limit, so we try to expand to different kinds of space, for example online media or podcasts, which have different specificity and strength. But it cannot replace the physical space because that is the site to build relationships with other people. (KUNCI member Ficky 2020)

The collective house, while strongly connected to Javanese culture, is being challenged by modernisation in different forms. Material conditions such as rental prices are making it increasingly difficult for artists and activists in Yogyakarta to afford space. As such, the members of MES56 view their space as an incredible privilege, one they do not wish to substitute with online platforms, but they also understand that ideas of social space are changing and that many people, especially the younger generation, cannot access collective houses, as Wimo commented:

It's a privilege to have this kind of space... The idea of social space other than your house, family or working space is still there but to have a collective space is expensive... So, you choose a cafe, coffee shop or something else. So it's still there but it's changed. (MES56 member Wimo 2020)

This change in social space and organising, as experienced by members of collective houses, is also occurring in Indonesian civil society in general, as evident in the recent mass demonstrations against the controversial Omnibus Law.

CHALLENGES TO COMMUNITY ACTIVISM IN INDONESIA

Since March 2020, the global COVID-19 pandemic has affected Indonesia deeply, especially its economy. In order to cope with the economic recession, the government introduced a bill known as Omnibus Bill on Job Creation to boost investments in the country (Maulia 2020; Panimbang 2020). From the beginning, the bill has been controversial among the Indonesian public as it affects seventy-nine existing laws, including labour law, environmental protection law, as well as legislation relating to natural resources. In June 2020, prior to the Omnibus Bill, the President and the People's Representative Council tested the waters of opposition by adopting another controversial bill to amend the existing legislation concerning mineral and coal mining. As this law-making process did not trigger significant opposition in the time of the pandemic, it can be assumed that the Omnibus Bill was also prompted by the strategic utilisation of mass social restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Hence, public debates concerning the bill took place on social media platforms. This situation of the pandemic considerably limited the ability of social groups, especially labour unions, environmental activists, and the student movement to organise in opposition to the bill. In contrast, a group of buzzers and influencers, including celebrities, were also mobilized to build public opinion by utilising their millions of followers to amplify the message on the urgency of the bill. Furthermore, in an attempt to claim transparency in law-making, the People's Representative Council used a live stream on the Facebook platform to show how the discussion of the bill took place in parliament, expecting to close the necessity for public demonstration.

Finally, in October 2020, the Omnibus Bill was adopted as Omnibus Law on Job Creation by the President and the People's Representative Council. However, the newly enacted law has continuously been protested against by many social movements who are concerned by the impacts of the law on their livelihood. Besides lowering the labour standards, regression of environmental safeguards has been another contentious issue with regard to the Omnibus Law. On labour standards, one of the crucial changes concerns contracting labour. Prior to the Omnibus Law, contracting labour was only allowed for the maximum of three consecutive years and the employment status should then be transformed into – permanent labour for the following term. After the enactment of the law, this provision has been omitted; consequently, a worker may be employed as a contracting labourer for his/her productive life – a far more precarious arrangement than being employed on a permanent contract in terms of wages, pensions, and health benefits.

With regard to changes to environmental safeguards, one important feature in the regressed environmental law is the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), as Omnibus Law reduces the number of parties that can be involved in any assessment. Now, only those determined as 'directly affected communities' are given space to participate, while environmental organisations or other concerned citizens are denied access to participation. Moreover, a compulsory obligation to designate forest areas at the minimum of thirty percent for every region has been omitted by Omnibus Law. Consequently, this may be used to justify the conversion of Papuan forests that cover more than seventy percent of the terrestrial land (Andriansyah et al. 2018) into palm oil plantations.

Despite the mass social restrictions, demonstrations occurred in thirty-four cities across the country (Sidu and Wang 2020). This was aided by social media, through which posters for mobilisation and live streaming of demonstrations in the field were circulated in order to attract more audiences. However, demonstrators faced severe repression by the police. According to Amnesty International (2020), 411 people were victims of police brutality, mostly students, and 6658 people were arrested, including journalists. The protesters were not only repressed physically but morally they were condemned by 'opinion makers' supportive of the regime as irresponsible citizens for not following the COVID-19 health protocols.

The mass social restrictions, as well as the ongoing police repression of demonstrators have resulted in many groups having to heavily rely on social media platforms as a tool of organising and dissent. For example, Academics against Omnibus Law, a network of progressive university lecturers that opposes the law, organised a series of Lectures with Peoples (Kuliah Bersama Rakyat/KBR) online. This strategy for conducting open lectures in the public sphere has been popular to challenge state development projects that are considered detrimental to people's livelihood and the environment. Previously, such a strategy had been conducted in the field as a form of direct action. However, in the context of the struggles against the Omnibus Law, it has gone online through YouTube. The banners and flags that are common in a movement have transformed into taglines on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube.

Furthermore, political struggles mediated by platform capitalism have centralised the movement and created a sense of hierarchy among actors involved in the movement. As the lecture series were only available online at a designated YouTube channel, namely Andalas University's Centre for Constitutional Studies (Pusako), the channel has become the centre of activity. Besides increasing views and subscriptions to the channel, this has managed to increase the profile of the centre and its figures, behind which an opportunity has been invited for capturing the centre or its figures by the state in anticipation of a similar movement in the future. In addition, as the strategy goes online through social media platforms, the ways in which the effectiveness of the movement is measured have also changed. Unlike before, when the visibility and ability of organised mass movements to suppress the state and business operations manifested directly, the effectiveness now relies on a quantitative exposure to social movements as shared online, indicated as 'likes,' 'followers,' 'shares,' and 'comments.' In fact, it remains unclear what this exposure signifies and how such exposure encourages actual action against the government legislation.

Indeed, the activists are not unaware of the problem of using platform capitalism in their movement. As mentioned above, the reliance on the platforms to share and mobilise in opposition to the Omnibus Law should be seen as an attempt to compensate for the difficulties of conducting direct mobilisation during the COVID-19 pandemic. They have tried to navigate the platforms in order to build a public discourse on the Omnibus Law. However, they are not the only ones to attempt this. The government has mobilised influencers to counter-narratives circulated by opposition groups. As a result, the competing narratives shared through platform capitalism have created what Gramsci (2011) terms a 'war of position.' But to the platforms, it does not matter which narratives are true or false, what matters to them is data that can be mined from the circulation of shares, likes, comments, or views, and through which future behaviour of their users can be predicted for better extraction of profit (Büscher 2021).

What implications this use of platforms will have on the longevity of the movements against the Omnibus Law and on Indonesian civil society more broadly remains to be seen. In the context of using platform capitalism in the wildlife conservation movement, Büscher (2021) observes that due to competing narratives circulated through the platforms, there are at least two emerging impacts. Firstly, the corporeality in which direct interactions are needed to build trust, collective identity, and a sense of comradeship have been replaced by unclear or even unidentified constituents of the movement. Secondly, there are infinite distractions in the platforms that may affect the ability to build a comprehensive understanding of the cause, and in turn, this may prevent possibilities for radical political action. Papacharissi (2010) argues that political conscience emerging through platform capitalism is privatised rather than collective; hence, political emancipation would take place in private instead of in public spaces. This observation may be one possible implication for the contemporary social movements in Indonesia.

The positive impact of the use of platform capitalism to build a social movement has been widening the reach of audiences. However, some immediate negative impacts of the use of platform capitalism by social movements can be identified. The potential for the state to utilise platforms in the repression and surveillance of activists, as has been witnessed in social rebellions and movements elsewhere in the world (Morozov 2009), is already evident in Indonesia. So far, at least two Twitter accounts operated by a coalition of civil society organisations, *Fraksi Rakyat Indonesia* and *Bersihkan Indonesia*, have been restricted by Twitter after a series of tweets that challenged the Omnibus Law (Safenet 2020). Besides restrictions, incidents of attacking and hacking social media accounts belonging to opponent groups of the Omnibus Law were reportedly increased during October 2020, especially after the law's enactment (Muhajir 2020). Following the wide use of social media for criticising the government, early in 2021, the Indonesian National Police established a task force known as the virtual police to scrutinise cyberspace. The Chief of the Indonesian National Police, General Listyo Sigit, claims that the aims for establishing the virtual police are to educate citizens to use social media wisely (Mansur 2021). However, civil society organisations have criticised such an establishment as an indication of a strengthening of the state's penetration into the cybersphere and a movement toward a "police state" (Zaenudin 2021). This furthers concerns by activists around issues of platform capitalism that could be utilised by the state for repression and intimidation.

With regards to the broader implications of platform capitalism on Indonesian society and community activism and whether or not there is a potential for alternative economic or social models, the members of KUNCI and MES56 are hopeful, as KUNCI member Ricky explained:

I think the idea of boundaries, or just how far it [platform capitalism] can go is interesting... Because if you still believe in old Karl Marx, that is if this has the same logic of capitalism, you will have this same logic and possibility of crisis and this will

bring some change to the system, so it would not become a bleak future. (KUNCI member Ricky 2020)

CONCLUSION

Indonesian society may already be at the brink of a crisis now. The Omnibus Law has been likened to a return to the autocratic oligarchy of the Suharto era (Maulia 2020; Panimbang 2020; Wardana 2020), and while civil society continues to resist the laws online and on the streets, much of the country is experiencing the devastating effects of the pandemic and economic crisis. In this volatile situation, the role of community activism and social organisation is arguably more important than ever. Historically, collective houses in Yogyakarta acted as a base for community art and activism, experimenting with new forms of social organisation and developing social relationships through community struggle. However, changes to social connectivity under platform capitalism could impact on the significance and function of these spaces. Furthermore, a reliance on platforms in social movements, while providing new tools for the sharing of information and a means by which to circumvent some forms of state repression, is beginning to present serious problems for activists.

There remain questions around how activists and others may negotiate the problems of platform capitalism. While there have been attempts elsewhere to establish alternative platforms such as the Diaspora network (Diaspora 2021), the vast majority of people in Indonesia are still connected to big tech platforms such as WhatsApp and Facebook. Therefore, the reach of any alternatives is so limited that they are largely deemed ineffective substitutes (Grenfell 2021). There are also questions around the potential effectiveness of the governmental regulation of platforms, as well as the possibility of activists and others disengaging entirely from platforms in favour of physical organising (Grenfell 2021). However, this study indicates that regardless of the problems outlined, those currently active within the two collective houses in Yogyakarta, as well as some of those involved with the demonstrations against the Omnibus Law, will continue to rely on platforms as tools of social organising.

It is finally important to note that regardless of whether or not the problems associated with platform capitalism can be overcome, the results of this study indicate that platforms cannot yet be considered a viable substitute for physical organising. Ultimately, the current social unrest in Indonesia may prove to be an integral testing ground for the limitations and boundaries of platform capitalism in facilitating social change.

REFERENCES

- Amnesty International. 2020. *Press release: Indonesia: Investigate verified evidence of police violence during Omnibus Law protests*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.amnesty.id/indonesia-investigate-verified-evidence-of-police-violence-during-omnibus-law-protests>
- Arbuckle, Heidi. 2000. "Of pigs, puppets and protest." *Inside Indonesia* 64. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.insideindonesia.org/of-pigs-puppets-and-protest>
- Andriansyah, Muhamad, Josefhine Chitra, Rizky Firmansyah and Arief Wijaya. 2018. *Indonesia's Last Forest Frontier: 3 Facts to Know About Papua*. World Resources Institute. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.wri.org/blog/2018/11/indonesias-last-forest-frontier-3-facts-know-about-papua>
- Ardizzoni, Michela. 2013. "Tactical media practices in Italy: The case of Insu⁺tv." *Journalism* 14, no. 7: 868–884.
- Atton, Chris. 2002. *Alternative media*. London: Sage.
- Büscher, Bram. 2021. *The Truth about Nature: Environmentalism in the Era of Post-Truth Politics and Platform Capitalism*. Oakland, California. University of California Press.
- Castells, Manuel. 2012. "Networks of outrage and hope – social movements in the internet age." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 25, no. 3: 398–402.
- Chang, Heewon. 2016. Individual and Collaborative Auto-ethnography as Method: A Social Scientist's Perspective. *Handbook of Auto-ethnography*. New York: Routledge.
- Diani, Mario. 2000. "Social movement networks virtual and real." *Information, Communication and Society* 3, no. 3: 386–401.
- Diaspora*. 2020. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://diasporafoundation.org>
- Dijck, Jose v. 2013. *Culture of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Dijck, Jose v., and Kenneth L Hacker. 2000. "What is Digital Democracy?" In *Digital Democracy: Issues of Theory and Practice*. CA, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Foulcher, Keith. 1986. *Social commitment in literature and the arts: The Indonesian 'Institute of People's Culture' 1950-1965*. Clayton: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University.
- Fuchs, Christian. 2014. *OccupyMedia! The Occupy Movement and Social Media in Crisis Capitalism*. Winchester, Zero Books.
- Fuchs, Christian, and Daniel Trottier. 2017. "Internet surveillance after Snowden: A critical empirical study of computer experts' attitudes on commercial and state surveillance of the Internet and social media post-Edward Snowden." *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 15, no. 1.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 2011. *Prison Notebooks*. New York City. Columbia University Press.
- Greenhouse. 2019. *Indonesia's Social Media Landscape: An Overview*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://greenhouse.co/blog/indonesias-social-media-landscape-an-overview>

- Grenfell, Raymond. 2020. "Addressing platform capitalism: The legacy of Indymedia and online participatory democracy." *Journal of Alternative & Community Media* 5, no 2: 211-227.
- Grenfell, Raymond. 2020. "A Brief History of MES56 in Jogjakarta." *Perth Indymedia*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://soundcloud.com/perth-indymedia/a-brief-history-of-mes56>
- Hermingrum, Sri. 2015. "Javanese Communal Ceremony in Urban Area: Crossing Border and Coming to an End." *The Asian Conference on Arts & Humanities 2015*. Official Conference Proceedings: 455-466.
- Juris, Jeffrey S. 2005. "The new digital media and activist networking within anti-corporate globalization movements." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 597, no 1: 189-208.
- Juris, Jeffrey S. 2012. "Reflections on #Occupy Everywhere: Social media, public space, and emerging logics of aggregation." *American Ethnologist* 39, no. 2.
- Jurriens, Edwin. 2013. "Social Participation in Indonesian Media and Art: Echoes from the Past, Visions for the Future." *Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia* 169, no. 1: 11-25.
- Keller, Anett. 2012. "Art for The People." *Inside Indonesia* 108. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.insideindonesia.org/art-for-the-people>
- KUNCI. (n.d). *About Us*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <http://kunci.or.id/about-us>
- KUNCI member Ficky. (2020). Interview by Rangga Purabaya. *Indymedia*. RTRFM 92.1, 20 June, 2020.
- KUNCI member Ricky. (2020). Interview by Rangga Purabaya. *Indymedia*. RTRFM 92.1, 20 June, 2020.
- Kvale, Steinar. 2007. "Conducting an interview." *Doing Interviews*. London, Sage Publications. 52-66.
- Lievrouw, Leah. 2011. *Alternative and activist new media*. Oxford. Polity Press.
- Lim, Merlyna. 2014. "Seeing spatially: people, networks and movements in digital and urban spaces." *International Development Planning Review* 36, no. 1: 51-72.
- Lim, Merlyna. 2012. "Bodies and Bytes." *The Architectural Review* 231, no. 1383: 20-21.
- Mansur, Ali. 2021. "Penjelasan Polri Soal Pembentukan Polisi Virtual." *Republika*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.republika.co.id/berita/qopxxh396/penjelasan-polri-soal-pembentukan-polisi-virtual>
- Maulia, Erwida. 2020. "Jokowi's bid to centralise power stirs Suharto memories." *Nikkei Asia*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://asia.nikkei.com/Politics/Jokowi-s-bid-to-centralize-power-stirs-Suharto-memories2>
- MES56 member Wimo. (2020). Interview by Rangga Purabaya. *Indymedia*. RTRFM 92.1, 7 June, 2020. Podcast. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://soundcloud.com/perth-indymedia/indonesian-collective-houses-and-platform-capitalism-mes56>
- MES56 member Dito. (2020). Interview by Rangga Purabaya. *Indymedia*. RTRFM 92.1, 7 June, 2020. Podcast. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://soundcloud.com/perth-indymedia/indonesian-collective-houses-and-platform-capitalism-mes56>
- MES56 member Akiq. (2020). Interview by Rangga Purabaya. *Indymedia*. RTRFM 92.1, 7 June, 2020.

- Podcast. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://soundcloud.com/perth-indymedia/indonesian-collective-houses-and-platform-capitalism-mes56>
- Muhajir, Anton. 2020. "Serangan Digital Yang Kian Politis Terkait Omnibus Law & Pandemi Covid19." *SAFEnet*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://id.safenet.or.id/2020/11/serangan-digital-yang-kian-politis-terkait-omnibus-law-pandemi-Covid19>
- Morozov, Evgeny. 2009. "Iran: Downside to the 'Twitter Revolution'." *Dissent* 56, no. 4: 10-14.
- Panimbang, Fahmi. 2020. Indonesia's return to an authoritarian developmental state. *International Politics and Society*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.ips-journal.eu/topics/democracy/indonesias-return-to-an-authoritarian-developmental-state-4734>
- Papacharissi, Zizi. 2010. *A Private Sphere: Democracy in the Digital Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Roosa, John. 2006. *Pretext for Mass Murder: The September 30th Movement and Suharto's Coup d'Etat in Indonesia*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Safenet. 2020. *Press Release: SAFEnet Mengecam Pembungkaman Akun-Akun Twitter Pengkritik UU Cipta Kerja*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.id.safenet.or.id/2020/10/siaran-pers-safenet-mengecam-pembungkaman-akun-akun-twitter-pengkritik-uu-cipta-kerja>
- Servaes, J. 2008. *Communication for Development and Social Change*. London: Sage.
- Sidu, Sandi and Philip Wang. 2020. "Hundreds arrested at protests over labor law in Jakarta." *CNN*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.edition.cnn.com/2020/10/08/asia/jakarta-indonesia-protest-jobs-law-intl/index.html>
- Srnicek, Nick. 2016. *Platform Capitalism*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Supangkat, Jan. 2005. "Art and Politics in Indonesia." In *Art and Social Change: Contemporary Art in Asia and the Pacific*, 221-222. Canberra: Pandanus Books.
- Taring Padi. 2021. *About Taring Padi*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.taringpadi.com>
- Unwin, Tim. 2017. *Reclaiming Information and Communication Technologies for Development*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Vaidhyanathan, Siva. 2004. *The anarchist in the library: how the clash between freedom and control is hacking the real world and crashing the system*. New York, Basic Books.
- Wardana, Agung. 2020. "Omnibus Law Cipta Kerja: Peneguhan Hukum Sebagai Instrumen Akumulasi Kapital." *Indoprogress*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://indoprogress.com/2020/10/omnibus-law-cipta-kerja-peneguhan-hukum-sebagai-instrumen-akumulasi-kapital/>
- Wardana, Agung. 2019. *Contemporary Bali: Contested Space and Governance*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Youtube. 2020. *Sexy Killers*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qIB7vg4l-To>
- Zaenudin, Ahmad. 2021. "Polisi Virtual: Jalan Pintas Indonesia Menuju 'Negara Polisi'?" *Tirto.id*. Accessed 14 January 2021. <https://tirto.id/polisi-virtual-jalan-pintas-indonesia-menuju-negara-polisi-gapP>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

RAYMOND GRENFELL is a PhD candidate in the School of Media, Creative Arts and Social Inquiry at Curtin University. His doctoral research examines the impact platform capitalism is having on the creation and continuation of prefigurative, counter-hegemonic institutions within autonomist communities. He utilises a multidisciplinary approach that includes podcast and radio production. He is a producer and presenter of the Indymedia radio program on community radio station RTRFM.

AGUNG WARDANA is an Assistant Professor at the Environmental Law Department, Faculty of Law, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. He holds a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) from Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Australia, and a Masters of Laws (LLM) in Environmental Law from the University of Nottingham, United Kingdom. He is the author of *Contemporary Bali: Contested Space and Governance* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

✉: raymond.grenfell@curtin.edu.au

✉: made.wardana@ugm.ac.id