

Amnesty international Indonesia's strategy for mainstreaming human rights in the 2024 presidential election campaign

Jessica Erviranda Ningtyas^{1*}, Havidz Ageng Prakoso², Shannaz Mutiara Deniar³

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia, email: jessicaerviranda18@gmail.com

²Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia, email: havidz@umm.ac.id

³Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia, email: shannazdeniar@umm.ac.id

*Corresponding author

Article Info

Article history:

Submission: 2025-12-15

Accepted: 2026-01-23

Published: 2026-02-07



This is an open access article distributed under the CC BY-SA 4.0 license

Copyright © 2026, the author(s)

ABSTRACT

The 2024 Indonesian Presidential Election exposed persistent tensions between human rights advocacy and state power amid shrinking civic space and weakened state responsiveness to accountability demands. Within Transnational Advocacy Network (TAN) scholarship, this context highlights an unresolved theoretical problem, namely the assumption that symbolic mobilization and transnational pressure necessarily generate substantive policy change. This assumption becomes problematic when advocacy achieves high visibility without meaningful state response, a limitation that remains underexamined in studies of symbol based advocacy and public participation. This article analyzes how the core instruments of TAN information politics, symbolic politics, leverage politics, and accountability politics are operationalized in Amnesty International Indonesia's #ALLOUT campaign in the post election period. Employing a qualitative approach, the study examines campaign documentation, organizational archives, and public advocacy materials, complemented by in depth interviews with Amnesty International Indonesia's National Campaign Coordinator and a representative of KontraS. The unit of analysis centers on the operationalization of TAN instruments in post election advocacy. The findings indicate that #ALLOUT operates through a symbolic declarative logic rather than escalating political pressure, prioritizing the maintenance of narratives, public memory, and normative claims. In this context, accountability politics functions primarily as a defensive mechanism to sustain human rights discourse rather than to induce direct policy change. This study contributes to TAN scholarship by reframing advocacy outcomes as the preservation of discursive space and normative continuity within restrictive political settings.

Keywords:

amnesty international; digital campaign; human rights

Please cite this article in APA style as:

Ningtyas, J. E., Prakoso, H. A., & Deniar, S. M. (2026). Amnesty international Indonesia's strategy for mainstreaming human rights in the 2024 presidential election campaign. *Jurnal Inovasi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik (JISoP)*, 8(1), 13-27. <https://doi.org/10.33474/jisop.v8i1.24716>

INTRODUCTION

The 2024 Presidential Election in Indonesia takes place within the context of rising tensions between the state and civil society actors, particularly concerning human rights issues (Mundayat et al., 2017). Despite Indonesia's ratification of various international human rights instruments, practices such as the restriction of freedom of expression, the criminalization of human rights defenders, and the stagnation in addressing serious human rights violations continue to persist (Caesario, 2024). Several reports indicate that regulations like the ITE Law and the Criminal Code are frequently used to limit public criticism and narrow the civic space (Pohan et al., 2025). This situation reflects a gap between the state's normative commitment to human rights and its implementation in domestic policy practices (Suryadi et al., 2025).

In this context, civil society organizations face complex challenges when human rights advocacy intersects directly with electoral political contestation (Widodo & Purwaningsih, 2023). This tension is not solely caused by the closure of formal advocacy spaces, but rather by the state's selective and defensive response patterns to human rights-based criticism (Bahar et al., 2025). These responses result in discursive, symbolic, and administrative resistance, meaning that human rights accountability demands are neither fully rejected nor substantively followed up (Harahap & Rauf, 2025). Under such conditions, human rights advocacy occupies a problematic position, as it operates within a politically democratic space procedurally but practically restricts the articulation and follow-up of human rights violation issues (Rusfiana et al., 2024).

As part of the transnational human rights organization network, Amnesty International Indonesia combines national advocacy with international connections within the domestic political landscape (Kristanti, 2021). In the context of the power transition post the 2024 Presidential Election, Amnesty International Indonesia launched the #ALLOUT digital campaign in response to impunity, the shrinking of civil liberties, and the weakening of the state's commitment to the human rights agenda (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024f). This campaign is positioned not merely as public mobilization but as an advocacy arena to demand state accountability and maintain human rights issues within the political discourse (Witianti et al., 2024). Consequently, the #ALLOUT campaign provides an empirical context for examining the advocacy strategies of human rights organizations in response to defensive state actions (Paskarina, 2020).

Previous research by Virgy et al. (2020) analyzed Greenpeace Indonesia's strategy in forming a transnational advocacy network to push for Wilmar International's NDPE commitment. Greenpeace succeeded in influencing corporate policy changes despite facing challenges in legal accountability aspects. Furthermore, "Turning Local Fight Global: The Transnational Advocacy Strategy of the Environmental Justice Foundation in Combating 'Saiko' Practices in Ghana" by Putri et al. (2022) demonstrated how EJF successfully utilized technology and international pressure to drive policy change in the Ghanaian government. Lastly, research conducted by Brillyanto (2021) titled "Digital Activism in Promoting Human Rights in Indonesia" revealed that digital activism significantly contributed to expanding the movement's reach, increasing public participation, and creating pressure on policymakers, despite being entirely online during the Covid-19 pandemic.

However, previous studies still have limitations in the analysis of digital activism and transnational human rights advocacy. Most studies emphasize campaign mobilization without examining the role of digital campaigns in demanding state accountability in the electoral context. In an electoral situation, digital campaigns serve not only as a tool for participation but also as a framing mechanism that shapes public orientation toward normative agendas, including human rights. Moreover, studies on transnational human

rights organizations' advocacy strategies are still relatively limited in analyzing how digital campaigns adapt when human rights issues intersect directly with electoral contestation, failing to explain how human rights are maintained as relevant public issues amidst political polarization. This gap becomes more pronounced during the power transition, when the state adopts an ambivalent stance, not fully resorting to repression but also not providing substantive responses to demands for addressing human rights violations. Therefore, research that places digital campaigns as a strategic tool in transnational advocacy networks to mainstream human rights issues and raise public awareness in determining human rights-based political preferences in presidential elections remains relatively underexplored.

Based on this gap, this study analyzes Amnesty International Indonesia's advocacy strategy in confronting state resistance during the 2024 Presidential Election through the Transnational Advocacy Network (TAN) framework. The study does not assess advocacy success normatively, but instead examines how transnational advocacy strategies are implemented, negotiated, and constrained by state responses in the domestic political arena. This research is expected to make a theoretical contribution to the development of Transnational Advocacy Network studies in the electoral political context and an empirical contribution to understanding the dynamics of human rights advocacy in Indonesia amidst the weakening of the state's commitment to fulfilling human rights.

In *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (1998), Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink introduced the concept of Transnational Advocacy Networks (TAN), explaining how pluralization of authority can be formed beyond state sovereignty and how local issues are bridged into global agendas through cross-border networks (Keck & Sikkink, 2019a). The development of communication technology has driven the adaptation of TAN through the use of digital media as a tool for information dissemination, support mobilization, and cross-regional coordination without altering its core principles (Hall, 2022; Margetts et al., 2016). In this study, TAN is used to analyze how advocacy strategies are implemented, negotiated, and constrained by state responses in the post-2024 Presidential Election context.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with a single case study design, focusing on the #ALLOUT digital campaign as Amnesty International Indonesia's advocacy practice post the 2024 Presidential Election. The qualitative approach was chosen because it is exploratory and interpretive, allowing for an in-depth understanding of the dynamics of transnational advocacy strategies in a specific political context (Sugiyono, 2013; Yin, 2018). This case study is positioned as a digital advocacy case study, where the digital space serves as the primary context for advocacy practices. The #ALLOUT digital campaign is treated as the empirical arena for advocacy strategy, while the primary data is obtained through the exploration of actors, processes, and strategic mechanisms behind the campaign. Primary data was collected through in-depth interviews with Zaky Yamani, the Campaign Coordinator of Amnesty International Indonesia. The informant was selected based on institutional considerations, as Amnesty International Indonesia recommended the Campaign Coordinator as the actor with comprehensive knowledge regarding the formulation and implementation of the #ALLOUT strategy. To strengthen the analysis and minimize bias from a single perspective, the researcher also interviewed Rizky Fariza, a staff member of the International Advocacy Division at KontraS, who was involved in the advocacy network and issue coalition related to the campaign.

In addition to interviews, this research utilized secondary data in the form of organizational documents (press releases, campaign reports, and official statements) as well

as news coverage from mainstream and independent media. Data analysis was carried out using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The coding process was iterative, linking empirical findings to the theoretical framework of TAN, while ensuring the validity of the data through source triangulation, data triangulation, and limited confirmation of the interview interpretation results. Ethical aspects of the research were fulfilled through informed consent provided to all informants. In this study, the TAN framework is used as an analytical lens, not a normative evaluative tool, to examine how Amnesty International Indonesia's advocacy strategies are implemented and negotiated within the electoral political context.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Post-Election Multi-Channel Advocacy by Amnesty International Indonesia in the #ALLOUT Campaign

Based on campaign documentation and interviews, the #ALLOUT campaign was launched by Amnesty International Indonesia post the 2024 Presidential Election as a digital advocacy initiative focusing on human rights accountability, with key issues including freedom of expression, police violence, and the resolution of past serious human rights violations (Yamani, 2025). Operationally, the #ALLOUT campaign was run through a combination of advocacy channels. First, Amnesty International Indonesia activated a mechanism for collective email sending to the elected president via the campaign's official website. This mechanism facilitated public participation by sending pre-formulated messages from the organization. Second, the campaign was conducted through the dissemination of educational content on Instagram, X, and the official Amnesty Indonesia website. Third, Amnesty International Indonesia organized discussion forums and film screenings in both online and offline formats (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024f).

In addition to digital activities, the #ALLOUT campaign also utilized symbolic actions and public activities as part of its advocacy strategy. One of the documented actions was the submission of 1,751 public aspiration letters to the Presidential Staff Office, gathered through citizen participation in the digital campaign and collectively handed over as an articulation of human rights protection demands (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024b). Amnesty International Indonesia also organized at least three public activities, including discussion forums and film screenings involving academics, human rights activists, students, and victims of serious human rights violations, held in Jakarta and several other major cities in hybrid formats (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024c, 2024e). Although focused on the domestic context, the #ALLOUT campaign demonstrated its connection to Amnesty International's international network, reflected in the use of campaign findings as submissions to the UN Human Rights Committee at its 140th session and in the review of Indonesia's compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) during 2024-2025 (Amnesty International, 2024). Nonetheless, the #ALLOUT campaign was managed and executed by Amnesty International Indonesia as part of national advocacy.

Empirical data shows that the #ALLOUT campaign's objectives, as conveyed by Amnesty Indonesia, were aimed at urging the new government to make a public commitment to human rights protection and to sustain public attention to human rights violations in Indonesia. Within the campaign's narrative, the issue of reinterpreting the history of human rights violations emerged alongside the development of a history rewriting project led by the Indonesian Ministry of Culture (Yamani, 2025). Besides internal documentation, Amnesty International Indonesia's activities on human rights accountability post the 2024 Presidential Election were also reported in mainstream media. *Kompas* reported Amnesty Indonesia's statements regarding freedom of expression, police violence, and demands for

the resolution of serious human rights violations post-election (Mantalean & Ramadhan, 2024; Sulisty, 2024).

When analyzed through the TAN framework, the #ALLOUT campaign reflects a hybrid advocacy model combining digital channels, symbolic actions, and public activities to maintain the resonance of human rights issues post the 2024 Presidential Election. This approach facilitated citizen participation through a digital network-based mechanism without relying on conventional mass mobilization (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). This strategy allowed the advocacy organization to sustain the issue after public attention to the electoral contest had waned, while also avoiding direct attachment to the electoral interests of candidates. The submission of 1,751 aspiration letters was not merely a visual symbolism, but rather a collective articulation of citizen engagement mediated by the digital space, signaling a shift in symbolic politics toward symbolic legitimacy based on documented participation accumulation (Keck & Sikkink, 2019b). The connection of the domestic campaign with Amnesty International's international network through the submission to the UN Human Rights Committee places the #ALLOUT advocacy within a multi-level space, though this transnational relation functions more as a channel for normative articulation and legitimacy than as a back-pressure mechanism that directly influences the state's response (Gatenio & Ningningyang, 2022). Mainstream media coverage further extended the issue's reach into broader public space, demonstrating the connection between the digital space and conventional media in the post-election agenda-setting process (McCombs & Shaw, 1972), although this increased visibility played a larger role in maintaining the public discourse than in generating direct political influence. Thus, media functioned as an arena for issue resonance, rather than an indicator of political leverage effectiveness.

Information Politics in Amnesty International Indonesia's #ALLOUT Campaign

Based on campaign documentation and interviews, the #ALLOUT campaign involved a process of information collection and management as the basis for formulating advocacy materials. The Monitoring Unit of Amnesty International Indonesia's Research Division systematically monitored alleged human rights violations through digital media and community reports (Yamani, 2025). Monitoring results were archived in a centralized database that recorded the chronology of events, categories of violations, and the sources of information used as references for campaign content creation. Interviews also revealed that Amnesty Indonesia gathered information through online media monitoring, direct reports from victims via complaint channels, and information exchanges with legal aid networks and other civil society organizations (Yamani, 2025). Furthermore, data from cross-organizational advocacy networks helped broaden the scope of information accessed by Amnesty Indonesia (Fariza, 2025). The information verification procedure involved field verification through site visits, cross-checking with various stakeholders including security forces, and source triangulation by comparing witness reports, media coverage, and data from legal supporters (Yamani, 2025). Verified information was then used as the basis for campaign materials, including case summaries, event chronologies, and demands in Amnesty Indonesia's public communications. Based on empirical findings, the process of monitoring, verifying, and managing information during the #ALLOUT campaign was carried out through a combination of digital infrastructure and cross-organizational advocacy networks.

The discussion underscores that information management in the #ALLOUT campaign is a form of information politics that is central but not deterministic in producing political change. In the TAN framework, information politics refers to the ability of advocacy actors to produce, verify, and distribute information in order to shape public understanding and

influence decision-making arenas (Keck & Sikkink, 2019a). The findings show that information management forms the operational foundation of the entire #ALLOUT digital advocacy strategy. Unlike the initial assumption of TAN, which often positions information politics as an early tool to trigger political responses, this study finds that in the context of the 2024 Presidential Election, information politics functioned more as a mechanism to stabilize the credibility of advocacy. The process of monitoring, verifying, and archiving information allowed Amnesty Indonesia to maintain narrative consistency and legitimacy of claims amid increasing political polarization post-election (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Thus, information politics in #ALLOUT was not aimed at creating an escalatory moment but at maintaining the reliability of advocacy in a politically sensitive environment.

The findings also show that Amnesty Indonesia operates as a knowledge broker, not just as an information producer. The integration of information from victims, legal supporters, media, and civil society networks into a centralized database shows that information politics is conducted through coordination across actors and levels (Cheng et al., 2021). In the context of digital TAN, this pattern reflects a shift from hierarchical information flows to a more decentralized but coordinated configuration through the organization's digital infrastructure. Information is no longer produced linearly but circulates and is filtered in layers. The strict verification procedures show that information politics in #ALLOUT also serves as a risk mitigation mechanism. In human rights advocacy, the risks of misinformation, criminalization, and delegitimization are inherent structural challenges faced by civil society organizations. The findings suggest that information politics not only strengthens campaign messaging but also protects the organization from potential political and legal backlash. Thus, information politics simultaneously functions as both an advocacy strategy and an institutional protection mechanism (Mcpherson, 2018).

Further findings indicate that information politics in the #ALLOUT campaign is not a separate initial stage but is continuously integrated with other advocacy instruments. Verified information was used as the basis for creating case chronologies, thematic summaries, and demand points that were later articulated through symbolic politics and the mobilization of shame. However, the findings also suggest that the success of information politics does not automatically transform into political leverage or state accountability. Producing credible knowledge is a prerequisite but not a guarantee for policy change (Iftikhar et al., 2025). In practice, information management enables Amnesty Indonesia to maintain normative pressure and the visibility of human rights issues, but it still faces state resistance and fragmentation of public attention. This condition shows that in the contemporary political landscape, information politics functions more as a strategic foundation for advocacy than as an instrument that directly generates state responses (Mcpherson, 2018).

Overall, this discussion represents an adaptation of TAN in post-election digital advocacy. This practice emphasizes that the production and management of knowledge are key resources for advocacy organizations, but their effectiveness depends on their connection with other advocacy instruments and the broader political context (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Thus, this finding enriches the TAN literature by showing that information politics in the digital era operates as advocacy infrastructure that maintains the continuity of normative pressure, rather than as a trigger for direct political change.

Symbolic Politics in Amnesty International Indonesia's #ALLOUT Campaign

The research findings show that symbolic politics in the #ALLOUT campaign were implemented in a structured manner, based on an internally developed strategic framework. Interviews with Amnesty Indonesia revealed that campaign activities were not reactive but

based on an explicitly formulated theory of change. The informant emphasized that each campaign action stemmed from a clear causal assumption regarding the impact of specific advocacy efforts (Yamani, 2025). This framework was outlined in an internal action circular, which served as an operational guide for all campaign elements, from digital content production to the execution of advocacy actions. In this context, the #ALLOUT campaign was launched as a symbolic response to the slogan #AllIn in the 2024 Presidential Election contest. The research findings indicate that Amnesty Indonesia took advantage of the electoral political momentum by creating a counter-slogan as a symbol of critique. The #ALLOUT slogan was understood as a shift in message from a political victory orientation to a demand for human rights enforcement (Yamani, 2025). The campaign encompassed three main issues: freedom of expression, police violence, and the resolution of past serious human rights violations. Thus, #ALLOUT functioned as an umbrella symbol that consolidated various human rights issues into a single campaign narrative.

The findings show that symbolic politics in the #ALLOUT campaign were carried out through slogans, the production and distribution of visual content, and digital narratives, all of which were strictly controlled through a quality assurance process before being published on Instagram, X, and Amnesty Indonesia's official website. This process involved the research division to ensure accuracy of substance and legality, and the campaign division to maintain message consistency with advocacy goals while mitigating legal risks given the sensitivity of human rights issues, which could provoke repressive responses from the state (Yamani, 2025). Amnesty Indonesia used social media and its website to represent the ITE Law and the Criminal Code as symbols of the state's structural repression against freedom of expression and the broader civil space (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024d). Interviews with KontraS indicated that the criminalization cases involving Fatia Maulidiyanti and Haris Azhar triggered episodic coordination among civil society organizations. However, the study emphasizes that these cases were not positioned as the main symbol of the #ALLOUT campaign but instead served as empirical evidence confirming the pattern of criminalization highlighted by Amnesty Indonesia in its digital campaign (Fariza, 2025). The integration of symbolic politics was further strengthened by activating collective memory of past human rights violations, reflected in the #SeptemberHitam campaign post on September 1, 2024, which commemorated events such as the murder of Munir Said Thalib, the Tanjung Priok Tragedy, and the death of Salim Kancil, while also encouraging public participation in the #ALLOUT campaign by writing letters to the elected president (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024b, 2024a). Thus, symbolic politics in the #ALLOUT campaign was executed through the integration of campaign slogans, repressive legal regulations, criminalization cases, and historical memories of human rights violations into advocacy materials and activities in a layered and sustained manner.

This discussion situates the #ALLOUT campaign's symbolic politics as an empirical case that demonstrates the shift in advocacy symbolism in the digital post-election era. The research findings show that symbolic politics in #ALLOUT did not operate as a single iconic symbol but as a layered and ongoing process of symbolization (Rosmilawati et al., 2024). Unlike the classical understanding that treats symbols as triggers for brief attention, symbolic politics in #ALLOUT was implemented through the internalization of a theory of change and operational mechanisms that ensured symbolic consistency across channels. This indicates that symbolization in digital advocacy is no longer just a tool for initial mobilization but part of the strategic architecture of the campaign (Chakma, 2025). Thus, symbolic politics in this context shifts from representational practices to managerial practices, where symbols are produced, controlled, and reproduced as mid-term advocacy instruments.

In the context of the 2024 Presidential Election, symbolic politics in #ALLOUT also shows a shift in temporal function, where symbols are not aimed at directly influencing electoral choices but rather at maintaining the continuity of human rights issues in the post-contestation phase, when public attention to normative agendas tends to decrease. The use of the #ALLOUT slogan as a counter-symbol to #AllIn demonstrates a practice of issue reframing post-election, utilizing collective memory from the campaign without engaging in electoral competition (Rosmilawati et al., 2024). This symbolization was built through the accumulation of reinforcing representations, such as campaign slogans, repressive legal regulations (ITE Law and the Criminal Code), human rights violation cases, and the activation of historical memories, making the symbol work cumulatively and repetitively in the digital space, rather than as a single episodic message (Hall, 2022). The use of legal symbols allows the public to understand human rights issues as structural problems, while the activation of historical memories serves as a temporal link between the past and the present in electoral politics. In the context of TAN, this finding shows that symbolic politics operates as a mechanism of normative continuity to maintain normative pressure on the state during the government transition period, rather than merely as a dramatic tool to attract fleeting attention (Hoskins, 2020; Sierp, 2025). Thus, the #ALLOUT symbolic politics enriches the TAN conceptualization by demonstrating that post-election advocacy symbolization is cumulative, contextual, and oriented toward the maintenance of issues, rather than immediate mobilization.

Mobilization of Shame in Amnesty International Indonesia's #ALLOUT Campaign

The research findings show that the mobilization of shame in the #ALLOUT campaign was implemented through a combination of domestic and international advocacy efforts. Interviews indicated that Amnesty Indonesia's lack of material resources made its pressure moral and based on public exposure (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2025b; Yamani, 2025). At the international level, the research findings recorded that Amnesty Indonesia actively submitted reports to UN human rights mechanisms. These submissions were directed to several Special Rapporteurs concerning freedom of expression, violence by security forces, and the resolution of past serious human rights violations. According to the informant, these submission documents were confidential and not publicly disclosed. In addition to submissions, Amnesty Indonesia also participated in meetings with Special Rapporteurs to report on the human rights situation in Indonesia (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024g; Yamani, 2025).

The findings also indicate that Amnesty Indonesia participated in discussions and advocacy meetings in international forums, including in Geneva. These activities aimed to present Indonesia's human rights situation to international actors and expand attention to the issues raised in the #ALLOUT campaign. All international activities were managed and reported as part of Amnesty's global advocacy network (Yamani, 2025). Domestically, mobilization of shame was executed through public activities involving various civil society actors. One documented activity was the public discussion titled "Reflections on 79 Years of Indonesian Independence: Who Is Development For?" held on August 16, 2024. This event involved WALHI, Srikandi Lestari Foundation, and the Center of Economic Law Studies (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024e).

In addition to centralized activities, Amnesty Indonesia leveraged the network of local units and Amnesty Chapters to expand the reach of the #ALLOUT campaign by organizing public discussions, reflective activities, and social media campaign activities through the units' media. The findings note that Amnesty Chapters in Yogyakarta, Jakarta, Unsika, and UNAIR produced campaign materials related to these issues, along with calls for public

participation through petitions and discussions (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2025a). One tool of mobilization of shame was the #ALLOUT digital petition, which was used to demand the protection and enforcement of human rights following the 2024 Presidential Election (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2025c). Interviews with KontraS indicated that coordination among civil society organizations in the #ALLOUT campaign did not take the form of a formal coalition. Coordination was episodic and case-specific, particularly in response to certain issues such as the criminalization of activists (Fariza, 2025). Thus, collective work among organizations in the #ALLOUT campaign was not structured but emerged as a response to specific issues outside the campaign's formal structure. This condition indicates that mobilization of shame was carried out through a combination of international mechanisms, domestic public activities, activation of local unit networks, and digital petitions as a moral pressure on the state.

This section discusses the mobilization of shame in the #ALLOUT campaign as a practice of political leverage that operates in a limited and contextual manner in post-2024 Presidential Election digital advocacy. Within the TAN framework, mobilization of shame utilizes international norms, public attention, and a country's reputation to pressure state actors to change certain behaviors or policies. However, in the post-election context in Indonesia, these mechanisms did not function as direct coercive tools but as instruments for maintaining normative pressure (Liou, 2025). Unlike the classical TAN assumption, which places mobilization of shame as an escalatory phase when domestic channels are blocked, the findings show that Amnesty Indonesia implemented this practice as part of its transnational advocacy routine, rather than as a response to total impasse (Hall et al., 2025). Engagement with UN human rights mechanisms, international forums, and the global Amnesty network was more a reflection of efforts to expand the arena for articulating issues rather than confrontational pressure. Thus, the boomerang pattern of the #ALLOUT campaign operates partially and does not fully follow the linear escalation logic in classical TAN (Hall et al., 2019).

Mobilization of shame in the #ALLOUT campaign produced moral pressure based on public exposure, not material or coercive pressure, given the lack of resources to impose direct sanctions. Therefore, reputation, international image, and issue visibility became the primary mediums for exerting pressure (Kurniawati et al., 2025). Such pressure relies on the organization's ability to maintain public and international attention through the reproduction of medium-term normative pressure, rather than creating a single escalatory moment. At the domestic level, mobilization of shame was carried out through public activities, discussions, and activation of decentralized local unit networks, showing a shift from a collective action logic to a connective action logic, where public participation is mediated by loose networks and digital platforms without relying on centralized formal coalition structures (Hall et al., 2019). The absence of a formal coalition in #ALLOUT instead shows that normative pressure can be built episodically and issue-based through fluid and temporary advocacy networks, challenging the classical assumption that mobilization of shame requires civil society organizations to be cohesive (Hall, 2022). In this context, mobilization of shame primarily functions to maintain visibility on human rights issues during the early phase of the new government and shape the public agenda, despite facing limitations when the state responds defensively to international criticism or rejects the legitimacy of external pressure. Thus, mobilization of shame in the #ALLOUT campaign represents adaptive, contextual, and limited leverage politics, which primarily serves as a mechanism for agenda setting and maintaining normative pressure, rather than as an instrument to produce immediate and concrete policy change (Dannenberg et al., 2023).

Accountability Politics in Amnesty International Indonesia's #ALLOUT Campaign

The research findings indicate that accountability politics in the #ALLOUT campaign was implemented through monitoring the state's response, publicly articulating positions, and utilizing international forums when domestic responses were deemed insufficient. First, Amnesty Indonesia routinely monitors government responses through internal evaluations. These evaluations include assessing the campaign's achievements, implementation barriers, and the government's policy and national political dynamics. The results of these evaluations are documented in the annual report, which is publicly published by Amnesty Indonesia as part of the organization's advocacy and reporting work (Yamani, 2025).

Second, Amnesty Indonesia used press conferences as one of the mechanisms to communicate the organization's positions and notes regarding state actions. This is reflected in media coverage that reported Amnesty's criticism of state violence and restrictions on freedom of expression in Indonesia (Karmini, 2025; Nabiyyin & Sinambela, 2023). On December 9, 2024, Amnesty Indonesia held a press conference on police violence throughout 2024. The press conference was attended by the National Police Committee and members of the Indonesian Parliament, and was used as a forum for presenting Amnesty's findings to the public and relevant state stakeholders (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024c). Third, Amnesty International Indonesia raised issues related to the #ALLOUT campaign at the international level when the government's response was considered inadequate. These activities included submitting reports and information to UN human rights mechanisms, Special Rapporteurs, participation in the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process in Geneva, and reporting to international Amnesty offices. Informants stated that these activities were part of Amnesty International Indonesia's routine advocacy within the organization's global network (Amnesty International Indonesia, 2024g; Yamani, 2025).

The research findings also reveal that the Indonesian government responded defensively to some of Amnesty's international advocacy activities, including making accusations of foreign involvement and rejecting some of the criticisms raised. These responses were identified through interviews and media reports discussing the government's stance on international human rights critiques (Human Rights Watch, 2025; Yamani, 2025). Furthermore, Amnesty International Indonesia used international legal instruments, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), as normative references in framing advocacy positions and demands for state accountability. The use of this instrument was accompanied by monitoring government policies and actions at the national level, without relying on specific domestic legal mechanisms (Yamani, 2025).

Overall, the research findings suggest that accountability politics in the #ALLOUT campaign was carried out through a combination of monitoring state responses, publicly articulating the organization's positions, and utilizing international mechanisms as part of Amnesty International Indonesia's advocacy strategy. All these practices were identified as part of the advocacy process that occurred within the context of the #ALLOUT campaign during the research period.

The discussion of the findings related to accountability politics in the #ALLOUT campaign indicates that the practice of accountability was not directed at creating sanctions or direct policy change but rather at maintaining demands for state accountability through ongoing monitoring, public articulation of positions, and the use of international forums as spaces for normative legitimacy. This pattern marks a shift from the classical understanding of accountability politics within the Transnational Advocacy Networks (TAN) framework, which typically positions it as a subsequent phase after leverage politics when external pressure has successfully influenced state behavior (Keck & Sikkink, 2019a). The research findings show the absence of such a linear transition, where Amnesty International

Indonesia continued to monitor and report even though the government's response was limited or defensive.

In the post-2024 Presidential Election context, accountability politics operated in a declarative and layered manner and was closer to the logic of communicative accountability, which aims to maintain openness to criticism and demands through public visibility and media exposure, rather than enforcement-based accountability that relies on legal or institutional formal mechanisms (Chadwick, 2017). Therefore, the practice of accountability was not positioned as the "outcome" of successful leverage but as an independent practice to ensure that the issues remained documented and articulated in the public sphere.

In the landscape of digital advocacy and the shrinking civic space, accountability politics was executed through institutionalized monitoring in the form of internal evaluations, annual reporting, press conferences, and engagement in international mechanisms such as Special Rapporteurs and Universal Periodic Review. This practice reflects a shift in the meaning of accountability from demands for policy compliance to the production of public archives and the maintenance of institutional memory regarding state actions (Castells, 2015). The transnational connections in this context function more as a space for articulating issues and setting normative standards rather than a tool for coercive backlash, as evidenced by the government's defensive responses and rhetorical actions to reject international criticism (Risse et al., 1999).

By referencing international legal instruments like the ICCPR, Amnesty International Indonesia positioned itself as a norm entrepreneur, continuously reproducing normative claims through digital advocacy networks and participation patterns based on connective action, rather than relying on domestic litigation, which was considered less responsive (Harcourt, 2025). Theoretically, these findings expand the understanding of TAN by showing that accountability politics in the digital era and post-election context is non-linear, non-escalatory, and predominantly declarative. It can serve as a mechanism for maintaining normative pressure when both domestic and international leverage are limited.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the strategy of Transnational Advocacy Networks (TAN) in the #ALLOUT campaign operates in the post-2024 Presidential Election context, characterized by a weakening of the state's capacity to respond to normative human rights (HR) pressures. As a result, TAN practices do not follow a linear path as outlined in classical literature, but rather undergo contextual adjustments, with digital advocacy serving as the primary tool to sustain human rights issues in the public sphere after the electoral contest. The findings indicate that information politics functions as the foundation of advocacy through systematic knowledge management, symbolic politics is carried out as an issue reframing practice to maintain issue resonance, while mobilization of shame and accountability politics tend to operate in a declarative and symbolic manner when the state's response to public and international pressure remains limited. This condition demonstrates that the boomerang pattern in TAN is not fully realized, and transnational connections function more as a means of articulation and normative legitimacy rather than as a consistent mechanism of counter-pressure.

Theoretically, this study expands the classical understanding of TAN by emphasizing the symbolic, temporal, and contextual dimensions of post-election digital advocacy, where accountability is not always understood as the fulfillment of policy but as the practice of maintaining normative pressure in situations where the state's capacity to respond is weakened. Therefore, the success of advocacy is understood as the ability to maintain the continuity of issues and normative claims within a constrained political space.

This study has limitations due to its focus on a single advocacy organization and the limited access to state decision-making processes. Therefore, the generalization of the findings should be made with caution. Further research should be directed at the dynamics of contemporary digital advocacy, including the role of social media algorithms, counter-framing strategies by the state, power relations between NGOs and digital platforms, as well as cross-organizational and political context comparative studies.

REFERENCES

- Amnesty International. (2024). *Indonesia: Submission to the UN Human Rights Committee 140th session, 4-28 March 2024*.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2024a). *Catatan peristiwa pelanggaran HAM yang kelim di "September Hitam."* Instagram Amnesty Indonesia.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2024b). *Kebebasan berekspresi masih dibungkam aturan dan kebijakan pemerintah!* Instagram Amnesty Indonesia.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2024c). *Konferensi pers "Kekerasan aparat makin darurat."* Instagram Amnesty Indonesia.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2024d). *Pendapat dan Kritik dibungkam, apa kabar pemenuhan HAM?* Instagram Amnesty Indonesia.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2024e). *Allout diskusi publik "Pembangunan untuk Siapa."* Amnesty.Id.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2024f). *Kampanye #ALLOUT*. Amnesty.Id.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2024g). *Pemerintah Indonesia kerdilkan fakta dan kondisi HAM di Sidang ICCPR*.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2025a). *Mimbar Refleksi Penegakan HAM Indonesia dalam Lensa 100 Hari Kepemimpinan Baru*. Instagram Amnesty Chapter Unair.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2025b). *Laporan HAM Amnesty International: 2024 tahun menguatnya praktik otoriter di Indonesia dan dunia*. Amnesty.Id.
- Amnesty International Indonesia. (2025c). *Pernyataan Publik: Penyerahan Surat Kampanye #AllOut*.
- Bahar, A. A., Mardiyanta, A., Mirdad, M. A., & Wisnuyana, B. (2025). The discourse on the role of NGOs in Indonesia's public policy process NGOs terminology in Indonesian context. *JKMP (Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Manajemen Publik)*, 13(1), 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jkmp.v13i1.1822>
- Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(3), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brillyanto, R. A. R. (2021). *Aktivisme digital dalam mempromosikan hak asasi manusia di Indonesia (Studi kasus amnesty international Indonesia)*. Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Caesario, W. (2024). Kriminalisasi pencemaran kebebasan nama baik berpendapat ditinjau atas dasar berdasarkan pendekatan hak asasi manusia. *Amnesti : Jurnal Hukum*, 6(1), 130–144. <https://doi.org/10.37729/amnesti.v6i1.4025>
- Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the internet age* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power* (2nd ed.). Oxford Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190696726.001.0001>
- Chakma, K. (2025). A review of the role of social media in shaping social movements. *Social*

- Science Research Network*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5083142>
- Cheng, H., Wang, Y., Ma, P., & Murdie, A. (2021). Communities and Brokers: How the transnational advocacy network simultaneously provides social power and exacerbates global inequalities. *International Studies Quarterly*, 65(3), 724–738. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqab037>
- Dannenberg, A., Lumkowsky, M., Carlton, E. K., & Victor, D. G. (2023). Naming and shaming as a strategy for enforcing the Paris Agreement: The role of political institutions and public concern. *Political Sciences*, 120(40), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2305075120>
- Fariza, R. (2025). *Script wawancara kontraS*. Wawancara Pribadi.
- Gatenio, S., & Ningningyang, G. (2022). Transnational advocacy at the united nations for social workers. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work*, 7(4), 417–427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41134-022-00216-1>
- Hall, N. (2022). *Transnational advocacy in the digital era (Think global, act local)*. Oxford University Press.
- Hall, N., Basu, N. R., Chaudhry, S., Henry, S., Medie, L., Sundstrom, P. A., McIntosh, L., Vilán, A., & Zvobgo, K. (2025). Challenges and opportunities for transnational advocacy. *International Studies Review*, 27(3). <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viaf015>
- Hall, N., Schmitz, H. P., & Dedmon, J. M. (2019). Transnational advocacy and NGOs in the digital era: New forms of networked power. *International Studies Quarterly*, 64(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqz052>
- Harahap, H., & Rauf, M. (2025). Civil society criticism and state response: Democracy issues in Indonesia's counter-terrorism experience. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 6(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.58256/s7t1aa83>
- Harcourt, A. (2025). Digital rights activism in multilevel governance. *European Policy Analysis*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/epa2.70031>
- Hoskins, A. (2020). *Social movements, cultural memory and digital media*. Springer Nature.
- Human Rights Watch. (2025). *Indonesia: Meningkatnya serangan terhadap media jurnalis menghadapi ancaman, kekerasan polisi, dan pembatasan perjalanan*.
- Iftikhar, H., Shah, U., & Hashmi, U. (2025). Navigating the intersection of technology, disinformation, and human rights: Balancing freedom of expression and speech. *Jurnal Cita Hukum*, 13(2), 537–560. <https://doi.org/10.15408/jch.v13i2.47165>
- Karmini, N. (2025). *Amnesty International menyatakan Indonesia menekan kebebasan berbicara dengan melakukan penindakan terhadap demonstrasi publik*. AP News.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (2019a). *Activists beyond Borders*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801471292>
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (2019b). Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics. *International Social Science Journal*, 51, 221–233. <https://doi.org/10.1111/issj.12187>
- Kristanti, M. V. A. (2021). Jaringan advokasi transnasional (GAATW) dalam penyelesaian isu migrasi pekerja perempuan dan perdagangan manusia di Asia Tenggara. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional (JHI)*, 14(1), 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jhi.v14i1.20845>
- Kurniawati, D., Arianti, G., Kholisoh, N., & Fasta, F. (2025). *Aspikom untuk negeri: Kontribusi keilmuan komunikasi dalam transformasi sosial & digital di Indonesia*. Galuh Patria.
- Liou, R. Y.-L. (2025). Can international advocacy rally public support for human rights sanctions? Experimental evidence from the United States. *International Studies Quarterly*, 69(4). <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqaf075>
- Mantalean, V., & Ramadhan, A. (2024). *Amnesty sebut kekerasan polisi selama 2024 bukan*

- tindakan oknum, tapi kebijakan. Kompas.Com. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2024/12/09/14202121/amnesty-sebut-kekerasan-polisi-selama-2024-bukan-tindakan-oknum-tapi>
- Margetts, H., John, P., Hale, S., & Yasserli, T. (2016). *Political turbulence (How social media shape collective action)*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc773c7>
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2747787>
- Mcpherson, E. (2018). *Risk and the pluralism of digital human rights fact-finding and advocacy* (M. K. Land & J. D. Aronson (eds.)). Cambridge University Press.
- Mundayat, A. A., Narendra, P., & Irawanto, B. (2017). State and civil society relationships in Indonesia: A society-oriented reading in search for democratic space. *PCD Journal*, 1(1–2), 75. <https://doi.org/10.22146/pcd.25678>
- Nabiyiyin, M. H., & Sinambela, S. I. (2023). Peran Amnesty International pada pembatasan kebebasan berekspresi human rights defender di Indonesia: Studi kasus Veronica Koman. *Papua Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, 3(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.31957/pjdir.v3i1.2464>
- Paskarina, C. (2020). Digital activism and democracy in Indonesia: Learning from the Foregoing Research Issues (2014–2020). *Indonesian Journal of Political Research (IJPR)*, 1(December), 43–58.
- Pohan, I. A., Maharani, E., Lumban, B., & Amanda, F. J. (2025). SAFEnet and civil society dynamics in expanding digital public space in Indonesia. *JPW (Jurnal Politik Walisongo)*, 7(2), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.21580/jpw.v7i2.28133>
- Putri, K. R. N., Windiani, R., & Wahyudi, F. E. (2022). Turning local fight global: Strategi advokasi transnasional environmental justice foundation dalam upaya memberantas praktik “Saiko” di Ghana. *Journal of International Relations*, 8(3), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jirud.v8i3.34344>
- Risse, T., Ropp, S. C., & Sikkink, K. (1999). *The power of human rights international norms and domestic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rosmilawati, S., Toun, N. R., & Riyanti, N. (2024). Hashtags, resistance, and reform: the global rise of digital activism. *Sinergi International Journal of Communication Science*, 2(4), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.61194/ijcs.v2i4.681>
- Rusfiana, Y., Kurniasih, D., & Indonesia, U. K. (2024). The role of civil society organizations in promoting social and political change in Indonesia. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 11(3), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/2154>
- Sierp, A. (2025). The politics of memory: Between history, identity and conflict. *Government and Opposition*, 60(4), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2025.10011>
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metodo Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R & D*. CV Alfabeta.
- Sulistyo, P. (2024). *Amnesty internasional: Ruang kebebasan sipil mengkhawatirkan, kondisi HAM melemah*. Kompas.Id. <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/ruang-kebebasan-sipil-semakin-mengkhawatirkan>
- Suryadi, A., Misran, M., & Angkananon, C. (2025). Civil society - state relations: Investigating the discourse and practice of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Indonesia. *Jurnal Studi Pemerintahan*, 16(3), 276–307. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jsp.v16i3.465>
- Virgy, M. A., Djuyandi, Y., & Darmawan, W. B. (2020). Strategi jaringan advokasi transnasional greenpeace Indonesia terkait isu deforestasi hutan Indonesia oleh Wilmar International. *Journal of Political Issues*, 1(2), 74–91. <https://doi.org/10.33019/jpi.v1i2.9>
- Widodo, B. E. C., & Purwaningsih, T. (2023). Civil societies and issues of the decline of

- democracy in Indonesia. *International Conference on Social and Politics*.
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-194-4_8
- Witianti, S., Paskarina, C., Meilany, L., & Firmansyah, M. A. (2024). Digital repression and its implications for civic space in Indonesia during the covid-19 pandemic: A narrative review. *E-Journal of Media and Society (e-JOMS)*, 7(3), 63–79.
- Yamani, Z. (2025). *Bentuk dukungan amnesty international di Indonesia dalam memperjuangkan HAM melalui Kampanye #ALLOUT*. Wawancara Pribadi.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.