

ACCELERATING POST-PANDEMIC RECOVERY: THE STRATEGIC ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN BALI

AKSELERASI PEMULIHAN PASCA-PANDEMI: PERAN STRATEGIS MASYARAKAT SIPIL DI BALI

Gede Indra Pramana

Political Science Study Program, Udayana University
Jl. Raya Kampus UNUD, Bukit Jimbaran, Kuta Selatan, Badung, Bali 80361
E-mail: indraprama@unud.ac.id

Accepted: 23 March 2023 ; revised 22 August 2023 ; Approved 29 September 2023

Abstract

Since 2019, the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted people's lives; whether in terms of economy, socio-political life, or culture. Impact of the economic downturn was especially felt by inhabitants of Bali Island, who relied on tourism as their primary source of livelihood. After nearly two years of dealing with the pandemic, however, it seemed that The state's strengthened role was not enough to completely mitigate this situation. This paper argues that civil society possesses a strategic position that allows them to play an essential role in helping the process of socio-economic recovery. Drawing from case studies, this study also suggested that the position of *adat* (traditional customs and institutions), as an element of Balinese civil society, was vital given their unique position. The strategic position of *adat* was demonstrated by the fact that the government enlisted the help of *adat* institutions to mitigate the impact of the pandemic, as shown by the mobilization of *Pecalang* (Balinese traditional security units) to enforce restrictions on population mobility. Moreover, the traditional village provided the basis for recovery through the formation of the *Gotong Royong* Task Force for Traditional Villages, as well as the recruitment of village volunteers. Learning from the Bali case, this research shows that civil society has great potential to overcome the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords: Accelerating Recovery, Bali, Civil Society, COVID-19

Abstrak

Sejak tahun 2019, pandemi COVID-19 telah memberikan dampak yang signifikan bagi kehidupan masyarakat; baik dari segi ekonomi, sosial, politik, maupun budaya. Keterpurukan ekonomi terutama dirasakan oleh warga Bali, yang mayoritas bergantung pada pariwisata sebagai penghidupan mereka. Setelah hampir dua tahun menghadapi pandemi, penguatan peran negara terlihat tidak cukup untuk memitigasi dampak pandemi secara menyeluruh. Tulisan ini berpendapat bahwa masyarakat sipil memiliki posisi strategis yang memungkinkan mereka memainkan peran penting dalam membantu pemulihan kehidupan sosial dan ekonomi warga. Dengan menggunakan studi kasus, penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa kedudukan adat, sebagai elemen masyarakat sipil Bali, menjadi penting dalam konteks pemulihan di Bali. Posisi adat yang strategis pertama-tama ditunjukkan dengan pelibatan lembaga adat oleh pemerintah dalam upaya menanggulangi dampak pandemi, misalnya dengan mengerahkan Pecalang (satuan pengamanan adat Bali) dalam membatasi mobilitas penduduk. Kemudian, desa adat juga menyediakan basis bagi pemulihan melalui Satgas Gotong Royong Desa Adat dan Relawan Desa. Belajar dari kasus Bali, penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa masyarakat sipil memiliki potensi besar dalam mengatasi pandemi COVID-19.

Kata Kunci: Akselerasi Pemulihan, Bali, COVID-19, Masyarakat Sipil

Introduction

This research examines civil society's strategic role after the COVID-19 pandemic in Bali. Since the first COVID-19 case was announced in Indonesia in 2020, its impact has been felt in various aspects of people's lives, not only in the health sector but also in the economic, social, and cultural fields. Globally, the pandemic has been causing tremendous economic stress. In addition, borders closing between countries, followed by restrictions on community activities, affected people's social life.

Fakhrudin et al. (2020) explained that the context of handling the COVID-19 pandemic, which includes aspects of preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation, requires extensive stakeholder efforts. In general, government policies can be viewed as a transition phase and a recovery phase.

In the early period of the pandemic, government policies seemed to underestimate the impact of COVID-19 (Djalante et al., 2020). The initial responses in the emergency period were simply aimed to contain the number of patients infected with COVID-19 from 2020 to 2021.

Nonetheless, as the pandemic escalated, the government gradually took steps in a more deliberate manner, namely by forming a dedicated task force to handle COVID-19. Various policies were also enacted; from closing the borders, repatriating citizens, appointing COVID-19 referral hospitals, conducting mass vaccinations, to decreeing large-scale social restrictions. Vaccination was successfully carried out from early 2021 and continued gradually until the second stage, concurrent with other recovery efforts. However, success in handling the pandemic was not immediately apparent (Mietzner, 2020).

Policies taken by the government to tackle the pandemic were generally aimed at the behavior of citizens and their community, thus changing social dynamics. Restriction on mobility was especially emphasized, as seen in recommendations for citizens to stay at home, curtail mass socio-religious activities, and work from home. As such, over time the health crisis

gave rise to an accompanying conundrum: economic crisis.

Tourism was one of the industries most impacted by the pandemic. The Association of Indonesian Hotels and Restaurants recorded a loss of \$1.5 billion since January 2020 (Djalante et al., 2020). The region of Bali—where the inhabitants primarily relied on the tourism sector—took the brunt of the damage, thanks to a massive drop in tourist arrivals. Since the border closures until the reopening of international flights, foreign tourist visits have been minimal (Dahrul & Aditya, 2021).

Indeed, the government had tried to deal with the pandemic in Bali. Since 2020, there had been the formation of a COVID-19 task force, assigned quarantine sites, direct cash assistance programs, and vaccinations; all carried out both as first aid measures and attempts to accelerate post-pandemic recovery (Bappeda, 2020)

However, cooperation from various stakeholders remained necessary in order to eliminate the adverse effects of the pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic was not merely a health crisis, since it also produced socio-economic impacts. Tourism that had been the backbone of Bali's economy was halted, causing many workers to lose their livelihoods.

It is here where civil society plays a strategic role in overseeing state policies in handling the pandemic. Data transparency was especially a public concern in the early days of the pandemic, which was answered by several civil society actors who provided alternative databases and portals for COVID-19 cases in Indonesia. *KawalCovid19.id* and *Pandemic Talks* were notable representatives of these groups, among various other digital platforms with similar activities.

Moreover, because issues regarding recovery will mainly revolve around politics, economics, and social science (Fakhrudin et al., 2020), it is sensible for the government to acknowledge and involve civil society. Seemingly in accordance with the principle, the Ministry of Home Affairs held public consultations with Non-Governmental Organizations and Community Organizations

in 2020 (Ma, 2020). Likewise, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated the role of civil society and the media in guarding democracy. It is said as the key to successful post-pandemic recovery related to challenges and solutions in reducing the impact of the pandemic, especially for the poor and vulnerable groups in accessing health services, social services, and education. In addition, guarantees are needed to democratize global health to guarantee equal access to vaccines for the global community (*Peran Masyarakat Madani*, 2020).

This strategic role of civil society is critical to be studied amidst the various challenges caused by the pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic has rapidly spread across the globe since its first occurrence. In addition to its enormous and instant pressure on the national healthcare system, the resulting mobility restriction also affected the economy. With such a broad impact, the COVID-19 pandemic undoubtedly posed a systemic risk, one that will inevitably turn civil society into one of the main stakeholders.

The collaborative establishment of a local-level task force was an example of efforts to involve the community in handling the pandemic. However, the efficacy of community engagement during that time is yet to be scrutinized. In practice, civil society initiatives exist in various forms. Given the importance of public participation in recovery efforts, the social innovation framework is relevant in understanding civil society initiatives within the Indonesian context.

Indonesia's COVID-19 pandemic status was officially revoked by President Joko Widodo on June 23 2023, but the foundations for post-pandemic recovery might have been built well before that point. On one hand, it is certain that government policies were central in post-pandemic recovery—especially in the case of Bali, where almost two years of pandemic crippled its tourism-dependent economy. On the other hand, the importance of civil society in post-pandemic efforts cannot be overlooked. Traditional norms and institutions (in Indonesian: *adat*) are deeply embedded in Balinese society, possibly adding a different

dimension to civil society dynamics while offering alternative models of post-pandemic recovery. With those priors in mind, the primary concern of this study can thus be summarized as: what is the strategic role of civil society in accelerating post-pandemic recovery in Bali?

The State and Civil Society Amidst the Pandemic: A Comparative Review

In terms of the relationship between the state and civil society during the pandemic, studies on the strategic role of civil society generally look at the initiatives amid state uncertainty in responding to a pandemic. It can be done firstly by looking at the dimensions of autonomy, partnership, and solidarity (Kover, 2021). Some studies emphasized the challenging conditions faced by civil society organizations face amid the pandemic of COVID 19 (Anheier et al., 2019; Leap et al., 2022; McGee, 2022), whereas others focus on understanding civil society strategies in line with their repertoire of actions (Franco et al., 2020; Abers et al., 2021; Gaventa, 2022).

In the Indonesian context, the majority of the studies seek to understand how government policies dealt with the pandemic (Djalante et al., 2020; Mietzner, 2020; Fealy, 2020; Apriliyanti et al., 2021; Mudhoffir & Hadiz, 2021; Jati, 2022). Even so, only a few studies have looked at the government's response at the local level (Lele, 2021; Pradana et al., 2021). The least prevalent, however, are studies that discuss the strategic role of civil society in post-pandemic recovery.

Several early studies described the varying degrees of uneasy relationship between the state and civil society during the pandemic, as shown in several countries, i.e., China, Turkey, Hungary, Israel, and India (Kover, 2021). Schmid (2021) showed that in Israel, the ambivalence of state and civil society relations resulted from state policies that alienate civil society in handling the pandemic. Tandon and Aravind (2021) observed a comparable pattern in post-pandemic India, where the government issued policies that narrowed the space for

movement and the role of civil society through regulation, limiting public consultations, and diverting public funds through programs of government. These policies, in turn, worsened the relationship between the state and civil society.

Genc & Dogan (2021) revealed the difficulties experienced by civil society in responding to the pandemic in Turkey, where the country's growing authoritarianism became an obstacle to fundraising and distributing aid. Meanwhile, Kover et al. (2021) noted the dominance of the Hungarian government in handling the pandemic, where the latter employed the "4C strategy": cooptation, coercion, crowding out, and creation (i.e., creation of a new and obedient civil society). The strategy further narrowed the space for civil society to move amidst a pandemic, even though they also showed extraordinary flexibility and ability to grow solidarity among citizens.

Other studies observed collaboration between the state and civil society, which can successfully mitigate the pandemic's impact; as shown in Germany, Austria, the UK, and especially in South Korea. Zimmer and Priller (2021) noted that there had been comprehensive cooperation between the German government and civil society on various aid schemes. Civil society activities increased, in spite of growing protests against COVID-19 programs—which were fueled by the rise of right-wing groups.

Meyer et al. (2021) showed collaboration between the state and civil society in the context of the welfare state in Austria, which can be said to be successful in handling the pandemic. Even so, the study also mentioned persisting challenges in the collaboration to completely eliminate the pandemic's impact. Harris (2021) looks at the civil society movement with various initiatives carried out by civil society in England. Jeong and Kim (2021) also observed a rather ideal collaboration between the state and civil society in South Korea, where the government acted as the coordinator of various civil society actors in dealing with the pandemic.

In looking at the role of civil society, other researchers have attempted to map

various activities carried out by civil society actors. Carlsen et al. (2020) mapped out efforts to distribute aid to residents affected by the pandemic in Denmark, where it was found that the process depends on the extent to which affected residents are socially connected via the Internet. Franco et al. (2020) see various collective actions carried out by civil society in informal settlements in Latin America as targeting the most vulnerable affected communities.

By looking at civil society as an arena of power, this research seeks to trace the strategic role of civil society in Bali in post-pandemic recovery. Michael Edwards (2001) states that civil society can be understood based on its form, referenced norms, and space. This integrative framework can help us see civil society's achievements in various complex and challenging conditions, such as those faced after COVID-19.

Social Innovation as a Framework for Understanding Community Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Discussions of social innovation are common in social and political science. In the disciplines of political science and public administration, social innovation underscores the potential for social transformation from collective action and citizen mobilization in changing the traditional relationship between government and bureaucracy. It is deemed to encourage a more democratic process, including public participation in decision-making, especially at the local level. (Henderson 1993; Moulaert et al. 2005; Swyngedouw 2005 in Galego, 2021).

In simple terms, social innovation can be understood through two main concepts: 1) new social processes; and 2) new social outputs and outcomes (Nicholls et al., 2015, p. 3). The first aspect, the social process, focuses on social innovation to equalize the power gap amid economic inequality (Nicholls et al., 2015, p. 3). The second aspect emphasizes social innovation as a solution to market failures in meeting vital public needs (Nicholls et al., 2015, p. 4).

Better understanding can also be obtained by considering its operational level, i.e., micro, meso, and macro. These three measures allow us to quantify the complexity of the performance and impact of social innovation.

Social innovation is a word commonly encountered in discussions pertaining to development. However, its value as a concept that describes sustainable development is often overshadowed by its usage as a buzzword. This study leans towards the re-reading of the concept which seeks to offer a critical perspective that sees social innovation as a citizen-centered force. Within this framework, citizens play an active role through their agency in creating social value and, in turn, social innovation (S. Banerjee et al., 2020, p. 7).

Such a position rests on three assumptions. First, social innovation should not be seen solely as a creative process driven by a market economy. The prevailing market-centered approach to understanding innovation is relatively novel, and it downplays how emancipation and self-determination have historically been parts of innovation. Second, the economy is discussed as a collective attempt to manage resources, instead of a rigid interplay of market mechanisms. Therefore, in this framework, citizens are considered capable to act and participate according to principles of welfare redistribution and reciprocal action. Third, there is a need for acknowledgement of different material conditions and injustices. Thus, the approach must be committed to the recognition of alternative worldviews, values, and local knowledge (S. Banerjee et al., 2020, p. 5-6)

This study defines social innovation as various civil society responses (Chui & Ko, 2021). Specifically, this research pays special attention to citizen initiatives that not only filled the void in state policies in the early period of the pandemic, but also ones that provided alternative solutions to the problems experienced by residents during the pandemic in Bali. It is in line with Montgomery and Mazzei (2021), who perceive that social innovation is always related to aspects of scale, the involvement of actors, and the context in which it is located.

Following their account of social innovation, there are two emerging paths; on the one hand, social innovation emphasizes the fulfillment of economic needs, and on the other hand, social innovations seek to offer comprehensive social change (Montgomery & Mazzei, 2021).

Discussion

This section outlines the government's various ways of dealing with the pandemic. It firstly addresses policies issued by the government both at the national and regional levels; as well as statements issued by the government, which were collected from various media, both print and online. Special note is given to the government's changing policy narratives to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia.

The following section shall describe civil society's response during the pandemic period. The focus is on community initiatives that have arisen in response to a pandemic amidst uncertainties. In this context, citizen initiatives can be understood as social innovations emerging in a pandemic.

COVID-19 and the Indonesian Government's Response to the Pandemic

In the transition phase, policies of the Indonesian Government generally seek to contain the increasing spread of COVID-19. One of the government's initial responses was repatriating Indonesian citizens from Wuhan from early 2020. The citizens were flown home using airplanes of the Indonesian Air Force, before being asked to quarantine. Afterwards, the government restricts travel between the two countries (Djalante et al., 2020).

On March 2, 2020, President Jokowi announced the first case of COVID-19 in Indonesia. Number of infected patients surged in the following months, triggering a crisis in regions throughout Indonesia. The government then appointed national referral hospitals, which numbers continued to increase (Djalante et al., 2020).

The national government formed a Task Force for the Acceleration of Handling CoronaVirus Disease 2019 on March 13, 2020. This task force comprised officials from national ministries/institutions, including the National Disaster Management Agency, the Ministry of Health, other ministries, the Indonesian National Police, and the Indonesian National Armed Forces. This model of organization was then replicated at the regional level. The immediate response concerning COVID-19 shows that the government tried to urgently respond. .

However, further improvements were necessary in order to anticipate the transition phases of possibly recurring pandemic waves between 2020-2022. As such, the existence of the task force as an independent body proved to be short-lived. Since being assigned in March 2020, it only took two months for this first configuration of the task force to be disbanded. Its internal structure practically remained, but its functional role in dealing with the pandemic was then carried out under the authority of a superior institution: Committee for COVID-19 Response and National Economic Recovery. This committee was formed on July 20, 2020, and disbanded in 2023.

The Indonesian government's initial efforts to provide public information on the number of cases were carried out through the <https://www.covid19.go.id/> platform. Its database on cases was based on official records collected and coordinated by the Ministry of Health. However, some parties suspected a lack of data transparency and inaccurate reports (Djalante et al., 2020). The tally reported by the central government was consistently less than the sum of numbers collected by civil society initiatives—namely *laporcovid-19*, *kawalcovid19*, and *pandemictalks*—who aggregated data collected by regional governments (Setijadi, 2021). At the time, community initiatives that demanded transparency of data and information heavily utilized social media platforms, the alternative channels for the public to get information. These channels also disseminated information within the framework of public health education.

Several general trends can be observed in the Jokowi administration's pandemic policies.

Greg Fealy (2020) noted that government policies prioritized the economic sector over public health. It was somewhat consistent with Jokowi's policy preferences, as reflected in myriad infrastructure developments throughout his administration. Setijadi (2021) stated a similar concern, noting that business figures had asked Jokowi to reconsider the government's social restriction policy due to its potential to harm the economic sector.

In the economic sector, the government issued a National Economic Recovery (PEN) policy in response to the impact of the pandemic. Sparrow et al. (2020) noted that the business aid components are as follows: (a) business incentives—mostly tax deductions—worth 124 trillion rupiahs as well as 54 trillion for corporate financing; (b) 121 trillion rupiahs of support for micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises, mainly consisting of working capital guarantees and interest rate subsidies; (c) 106 trillion rupiahs for local governments and other sectors—of which 18 trillion was allocated for job creation and public work schemes.

Sparrow (2021) also noted that the government's social protection plans were carried out through pre-existing programs, such as (a) Family Hope Program; (b) Staple Food Cards and Basic Food Social Service; and (c) Direct Cash Assistance (known as *Bantuan Langsung Tunai*, BLT). In addition, the Government also provided pre-employment cards and discounts on monthly electricity bills. Sparrow (2020) commended these policies, but also stressed that they were not designed to handle the prolonged economic impact of the pandemic which might affect different demographics—e.g. urban and rural populations—differently. Furthermore, the database for these aid schemes had not been updated since 2015 (Sparrow et al., 2020).

Along with efforts to handle cases at the national level, another thing that needs to be noted is the involvement of state security actors. It was evident from the beginning of the pandemic: active military officers were key members of teams formed by the government. Moreover, the military was also massively mobilized to provide on-field security during the implementation of large-scale social restrictions

(also known as pembatasan sosial skala besar, PSBB). In other words, the military had an increasingly significant role and was involved in the life of civil society (Fealy, 2021; Setijadi, 2021).

The increasing role of state security actors can also be seen in the involvement of the State Intelligence Agency (or Badan Intelijen Negara, BIN). BIN was initially subject to the authority of the Coordinating Ministry for Law and Human Rights, but later reported directly to the President. From this, it is said that BIN has increasingly greater access to President Jokowi. Given the function of the Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs, it needs to be revised, which ensures transparency, accountability, and accountability in work carried out by BIN. The strategic role of BIN has further strengthened the tendency for the concentration of power during the Jokowi administration. It has implications for the involvement of state security actors in handling the pandemic in Indonesia.

Another essential aspect worth noting was multipartite innovation programs sponsored by the government. The effort involved private parties as well as universities and research institutions, carried out under the coordination of the Ministry of Research and Technology/National Research and Innovation Agency (or Kementerian Riset dan Teknologi/Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional, Kemenristek/BRIN). This policy line of encouraging innovations and their application produced a sizable number of social innovations over the course of the pandemic, amounting to 50 innovations, where the majority directly concerned the health sector (Putera et al., 2022). Through an act that could be perceived as an achievement for the regime, it was shown that innovations could be produced even in crisis situations, as long as the support from various stakeholders is present.

It also signified a shift in the government response to the pandemic situation. Whereas the government initially seemed to act half-heartedly, the accelerated spread of COVID-19 demands that the government respond thoughtfully to the crises. Significant changes were made when necessary, such as the

adjustment of the national budget in the attempt to alleviate the impact of the pandemic.

The national vaccination policy was vital in handling the pandemic at a later period. Vaccination efforts were carried out in stages; initially with priority for state administrators, health workers, and vulnerable populations. Later stages, which saw the inclusion of the general public and toddlers, became one of the keys to handling the pandemic in Indonesia. Along with the increase in vaccination rates, community activities were gradually recovering. Building upon these foundations, the national government proceeded to apply “the new normal” policy framework, of which the implementation was adjusted according to assessment of each region’s circumstances.

COVID-19 and Civil Society Responses to the Pandemic in Bali

The Provincial Government of Bali, represented by the Governor of Bali, I Wayan Koster, formed a Task Force for COVID-19 Handling on March 10, 2020. Its first chairman was the Regional Secretary of the Province of Bali, Dewa Made Indra. The next day, the first patient of COVID-19—a foreign national who had been treated for four days at the Sanglah General Hospital in Denpasar—was announced to have died on March 11, 2020 (Asmara, 2020).

Not long after, the Governor of Bali issued a circular letter pleading to reduce people’s mobility, which took effect from March 15-30, 2020. This action was taken after the Provincial Government of Bali established an Emergency Alert Status for Disease Outbreaks due to the Coronavirus on March 16, 2020. Notably, the relatively swift implementation period reminds us of the uncertainty in the initial period of the outbreak of COVID-19.

To deal with the spread of COVID-19 in Bali, the Governor of Bali and the Council of Traditional Villages of the Province of Bali, issued a Joint Decree on March 28, 2020, concerning the establishment of a Gotong Royong Task Force for the Prevention of COVID-19 Based on Traditional Villages in

Bali. With this joint decision, it can be seen that the role of traditional institutions and social arrangements (*adat*) has expanded. *Adat* was no longer limited to matters of communal norms and ceremonies but was involved in efforts to deal with this pandemic as well. *Pecalang* (Balinese traditional community guards or security officers), for instance, were mobilized to supervise their respective traditional village environments.

At first glance, this may seem sensible, considering the bond between Balinese people and their traditional institutions. However, the involvement of *pecalang* as the vanguard of pandemic management can be seen as an effort by the state to exploit the influence of traditional villages in order to appear present and concerned (Suryawan, 2022). Thus, one can be skeptical of the arrangement, since civil society could have been a mere extension of the state.

Bali, an international tourism destination, suffered a significant blow due to the pandemic. According to Statistic Indonesia (Badan Pusat Statistik, BPS) estimates, the number of unemployed people in Bali in 2020 would have reached 144,500. This equals a 268% increase compared to the previous year, where 39,288 people were listed as unemployed (Andrianto, 2022). This occurred because the government began to impose stricter population mobility regulations as soon as the pandemic intensified. The boisterous tourism industry in Bali dimmed after the guests left. Bali nightlife, normally bustling all night long especially in Southern Bali, suddenly ceased; leaving nothing but the quietness of a ghost town.

While the government also delivered sensible policies such as appointing health facilities dedicated for COVID-19 patients, they were also involved in promoting some scientifically questionable folk remedies. The governor of Bali, for instance, recommended drinking a mix of coffee and *arak* (a local traditional alcoholic drink) to boost the immune system. He also promoted the consumption of *usada barak*, a traditional herbal product, to achieve similar health benefits.

During this pandemic, at the end of 2020, the government announced vaccination programs to prevent further spread of COVID-19. The arrival of the first batch of vaccines in Indonesia was recorded as early as December 2020, followed by the next batch in January 2021. President Jokowi became the first vaccine recipient on January 13, 2021 (JawaPos.com, 2022). Afterwards, the free vaccination policy was gradually implemented in Indonesia. Bali became a region with a high vaccination rate (Timoria, 2021), in line with its preparations for reopening tourist destinations in Bali.

In another attempt to save Bali's tourism-dependent economy, The Government implemented the "Work from Bali" program, which sought to invite people to work from Bali. In the early stages, the Nusa Dua area was chosen as the location because it is managed by a State-Owned Enterprise (BUMN), namely the Indonesian Tourism Development Corporation (ITDC) (Kompas.com, 2021). In the next stage, the government prepared a Travel Corridor Arrangement that allows travel between the countries involved.

The National Disaster Management Agency also tried to contribute by organizing a disaster-themed research competition, "Ideathon Bali Returns", in 2021. Tripartite collaboration between BNPB, Regional Disaster Management Agency (Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah, BPBD) of Bali Province, and SIAP SIAGA (an Australian government program) also conducted similar efforts, as a show of support to the implementation of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (GPDRR) (antaranews.com, 2021). Despite the achievement, its efficacy as a pandemic anticipation policy in the future remains to be considered.

As mentioned above, the government's efforts in dealing with the pandemic were enormous. However, this merely puts the average citizens in the position of passive recipients. They are the party who felt the direct impact of the pandemic, yet they could not be actively involved in the programs to ease the situation. In response, community initiatives which aimed to raise communal solidarity were

established through various platforms, such as kitabisa.com.

Through this platform, anyone can donate. Kitabisa.com Founder and CEO Al Fatih Timur said that donations amounted to IDR 130 billion, thanks to the contribution of millions of fundraisers and donors who participated in the initiative since the beginning of the pandemic in Indonesia (antaranews.com, 2020). Citizen initiatives in responding to the pandemic can also be seen through the “WargaBantuWarga” initiative, a canal for public information and mutual aid.

Meanwhile, in the northern tip of Bali, village officials prepared their own scheme for residents affected by the pandemic. Many residents of Tembok village (Singaraja District) had migrated to the city to work in tourism prior to the pandemic. But as the pandemic unfolded, these workers were forced to return home because their employer could no longer provide accommodation for them. Faced with this problem, Dewa Komang Yudi Astara, Head of Tembok Village, resorted to making use of previously uncultivated fertile land in the area (Muhajir, 2020).

In this scheme, the recently-unemployed villagers were once again engaged in productive activity, this time through agriculture. The village officials provided the land, mostly drawn from communal possession. Various productive crops, such as vegetables and fruits, were successfully planted on village-owned land by villagers. Apart from that, Tembok Village also provides free health services for its residents, partly funded by plastic waste recycling.

In Southern Bali, a hardcore/punk collective, Denpasar Collective, carried out a communal aid effort called Punk Pangan. Driven by a community of civil society organizations, young people, and artists, the Punk Pangan action distributed free food assistance to residents affected by the pandemic in need from May to September 2020 (Anggawi, 2021).

Conclusion

The Indonesian government’s efforts in handling the pandemic can be observed in several phases. The ever-increasing number of cases, the complexity of logistics distribution, and limited resources put tremendous pressure in the early phase of the pandemic. At this point, the national government coordinated efforts simply to contain infection and mortality rates. Nationwide vaccination later became the turning point, marking the beginning of post-pandemic recovery efforts.

In the context of Bali, civil society response can be interpreted as an attempt to fill the void left by the state. When there is a surge of cases, residents’ initiatives try to actively contribute. Two primary forms of citizen initiatives can be inferred: in coordination with the government, or entirely independent initiatives.

The particular case of Bali showed the increasing role of Adat across various phases of pandemic management, such as the involvement of Pecalang and the way traditional village arrangements provide resources for the impacted villagers. The case of Bali shows how the role of civil society is essential in times of pandemic. Finally, the analysis results show general tendencies related to post-pandemic recovery: (1) There is a need to increase cross-sectoral collaboration between actors; (2) The increasingly strengthened role of the state in the life of civil society in Bali.

Bibliography

- Abers, R. N., Rossi, F., & Von Bülow, M. (2021). State–society relations in uncertain times: Social movement strategies, ideational contestation and the pandemic in Brazil and Argentina. *International Political Science Review*, 42(3), 333–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512121993713>
- Anheier, Helmut K., Markus Lang, and Stefan Toepler (2019). Civil society in times of change: shrinking, changing and expanding spaces and the need for new regulatory approaches. *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal*, 13 (2019-8): 1–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5018/economics-ejournal.ja.2019-8>
- Anggawi, S. M. (2021). “Punk food”: activism between climate and Covid crisis. *Social Anthropology*, 29(1), 249–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12992>
- Apriliyanti, I. D., Utomo, W. P., & Purwanto, E. A. (2021). Examining the policy narratives and the role of the media in policy responses to the COVID-19 crisis in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2021.1954770>
- Bayuo, B. B., Chaminade, C., & Göransson, B. (2020). Unpacking the role of universities in the emergence, development and impact of social innovations – A systematic review of the literature. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 155, 120030. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120030>
- Carlsen, H. B., Toubøl, J., & Brincker, B. (2021). On solidarity and volunteering during the COVID-19 crisis in Denmark: The impact of social networks and social media groups on support distribution. *European Societies*, 23(sup1), S122–S140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1818270>
- Chui, C. H., & Ko, A. I. (2021). Converging humanitarian technology and social work in a public health crisis: a social innovation response to COVID-19 in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*, 31(1–2), 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185385.2020.1790412>
- Galego, D., Moulaert, F., Brans, M., & Santinha, G. (2021). Social innovation & governance: a scoping review. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 35(2), 265–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2021.1879630>
- Djalante, R., Lassa, J., Setiamarga, D., Sudjatma, A., Indrawan, M., Haryanto, B., Mahfud, C., Sinapoy, M. S., Djalante, S., Raffiana, I., Gunawan, L. A., Surtiari, G. A. K., & Warsilah, H. (2020). Review and analysis of current responses to COVID-19 in Indonesia: Period of January to March 2020. *Progress in Disaster Science*, 6, 100091. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2020.100091>
- Doğan, E., & Genç, H. D. (2021). Early-Responding Civil Society and a Late Coming State: Findings from Turkey during the Pandemic. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2020-0049>
- Duque Franco, I., Ortiz, C., Samper, J., & Millan, G. (2020). Mapping repertoires of collective action facing the COVID-19 pandemic in informal settlements in Latin American cities. *Environment and Urbanization*, 32(2), 523–546. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247820944823>
- Fealy, G. (2020). Jokowi in the Covid-19 Era: Repressive Pluralism, Dynasticism, and the Overbearing State. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 56(3), 301–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2020.1846482>
- Fakhrudin, B., Blanchard, K., & Ragupathy, D. (2020). Are we there yet? The transition from response to recovery for the COVID-19 pandemic. *Progress in Disaster Science*, 7, 100102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2020.100102>
- Franco, I. B., Ortiz, C. U., Samper, J., & Millán, G. (2020). Mapping repertoires of collective action facing the COVID-19 pandemic in informal settlements in Latin American cities. *Environment and Urbanization*, 32(2), 523–546. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247820944823>
- Gaventa, J. (2022). Repertoires of Citizen Action in Hybrid Settings. *Development Policy Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12663>
- Harris, M. (2021). Familiar Patterns and New Initiatives: UK Civil Society and Government Initial Responses to the Covid-19 Crisis. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2020-0044>
- Jati, Wasisto Raharjo. (2022). The Impact Of Ongoing Pandemic Covid-19 On Indonesian Democracy: Democratic Breakdown, Political Inequality, And

- Deepening Clientelism. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, Volume 19 No.1 Juni 2022
- Jeong, B. G., & Kim, S.-J. (2021). The Government and Civil Society Collaboration against COVID-19 in South Korea: A Single or Multiple Actor Play? *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 165–187. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2020-0051>
- Kövér, Á. (2021). The Relationship between Government and Civil Society in the Era of COVID-19. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2021-0007>
- Kövér, Á., Antal, A., & Deák, I. (2021). Civil Society and COVID-19 in Hungary: The Complete Annexation of Civil Space. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 93–126. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2020-0060>
- Leap, B., Stalp, M. C., & Kelly, K. A. (2022). Raging Against the “Neoliberal Hellscape”: Anger, Pride, and Ambivalence in Civil Society Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic in the USA. *Antipode*, 54(4), 1166–1187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12813>
- Lele, G. (2021). Concurrency as crisis decision-making governance: Lessons from Indonesia’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2021.1960513>
- McGee, R. (2022). The governance shock doctrine: Civic space in the pandemic. *Development Policy Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12678>
- Mietzner, M. (2020). Populist Anti-Scientism, Religious Polarisation, and Institutionalised Corruption: How Indonesia’s Democratic Decline Shaped Its COVID-19 Response. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 39(2), 227–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103420935561>
- Mudhoffir, A. M., & Hadiz, V. R. (2021). Social Resilience Against COVID-19 Masks Indonesian Class Divide. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 22(1), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.1353/gia.2021.0014>
- Meyer, M., Millner, R., Pennerstorfer, A., & Vador, P. (2021). Partnership in Times of COVID-19: Government and Civil Society in Austria. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 65–92. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2020-0052>
- Montgomery, T. and Mazzei, M. (2021), “Two paths of social innovation in the post-pandemic world”, *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 450-458. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-03-2021-0018>
- Nicholls, A., Simon, J., Gabriel, M., & Whelan, C. (2015). *New Frontiers in Social Innovation Research* (1st ed. 2015 ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nugroho, Y., & Negara, S. D. (2020). *Urgent Need to Strengthen State Capacity: Learning from Indonesia’s COVID-19 Crisis*. 2020, 10.
- Pallas, C. L., & Sidel, M. (2020). Foreign Aid Reduction and Local Civil Society: Recent Research and Policy Guidance for Donors and International NGOs. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2019-0045>
- Putera, P. B., Widianingsih, I., Ningrum, S., Suryanto, S., & Rianto, Y. (2022). Overcoming the COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia: A Science, technology, and innovation (STI) policy perspective. *Health Policy and Technology*, 11(3), 100650. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlpt.2022.100650>
- Pradana, M., Rubiyanti, N., S., W., Hasbi, I., & Utami, D. G. (2020). Indonesia’s fight against COVID-19: The roles of local government units and community organisations. *Local Environment*, 25(9), 741–743. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2020.1811960>
- Suryawan, I Ngurah (2022) “Desa Mawacara, Negara Mawatata: Bali’s Customary Village-Based State Policies in the Time of the Covid-19 Pandemic,” *Jurnal Politik*: Vol. 6: Iss. 1, Article 2. DOI: 10.7454/jp.v6i1.328
- Setijadi, C. (2021). The Pandemic as Political Opportunity: Jokowi’s Indonesia in the Time of Covid-19. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 57(3), 297–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2021.2004342>
- Schmid, H. (2021). Reflections on the Relationship between the Government and Civil Society Organizations during the Covid-19 Pandemic: The Israeli Case. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2021-0003>
- Sparrow, R., Dartanto, T., & Hartwig, R. (2020). Indonesia Under the New Normal: Challenges and the Way Ahead. *Bulletin of*

- Indonesian Economic Studies*, 56(3), 269–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2020.1854079>
- Swati, Banerjee., Stephen, Carney., & Lars, Hulgård. (Eds). (2020). *People Centered Social Innovation: Global Perspectives on an Emerging Paradigm*. New York: Routledge.
- Tandon, R., & Aravind, R. (2021). *Source of Life or Kiss of Death: Revisiting State-Civil Society Dynamics in India during COVID-19 Pandemic*. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2020-0045>
- Timoria, I. F. (2021, May 23). *Vaksinasi di Bali Paling Cepat, Begini Penjelasan Pemerintah...* Solopos.com. <https://www.solopos.com/vaksinasi-di-bali-paling-cepat-begini-penjelasan-pemerintah-1127025>
- Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Tummers, L. G. (2015). A Systematic Review of Co-Creation and Co-Production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1333–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.930505>
- Youngs, S. B. T. C. R. (2020, April 21). *Civil Society and the Coronavirus: Dynamism Despite Disruption*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/04/21/civil-society-and-coronavirus-dynamism-despite-disruption-pub-81592>
- Zimmer, A., & Priller, E. (2021). A Patchwork Quilt of Programs. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 12(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2020-0050>
- Dahrul, Fathiya & Arys Aditya (2021 October 14). Bali Reopens to Foreign Tourists, But Flights Have Yet to Catch Up. bloomberg.com <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-10-14/no-flights-to-bali-yet-as-island-reopens-to-foreign-tourists#xj4y7vzkg>
- Folia, R. (2021, March 2). Menolak Lupa: Setahun Pandemi di Indonesia, Ini Daftar Pernyataan “Unik” Pejabat Kita. www.vice.com. <https://www.vice.com/id/article/93w7ga/daftar-pernyataan-dan-guyonan-nyeleneh-pejabat-indonesia-selama-setahun-pandemi-covid-19>
- Krisna. (2020 June 30). Pemprov Bali siapkan Tahapan Pemulihan dari Dampak Pandemi COVID-19, 30 Juni 2020 <https://bappeda.baliprov.go.id/2020/06/30/pemprov-bali-siapkan-tahapan-pemulihan-dari-dampak-pandemi-covid-19/>
- Ma, N. (2020, December 21). Atasi COVID-19, Kemendagri Gelar Konsultasi Publik dengan LSM & Ormas. *Detiknews*. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-5303463/atasi-covid-19-kemendagri-gelar-konsultasi-publik-dengan-lsm--ormas>
- Muhajir, A. (2020, September 21). *Desa Tembok Justru Menjadikan Pandemi sebagai Energi*. BaleBengong.id. <https://balebengong.id/desa-tembok-justru-menjadikan-pandemi-sebagai-energi/>
- Nugraha, Aulia Rahman. Kumparan. (2020, February 10). *Peneliti Harvard Prediksi Virus Corona Sudah Masuk Indonesia*. Kumparan. <https://kumparan.com/kumparansains/peneliti-harvard-prediksi-virus-corona-sudah-masuk-indonesia-1soDN9GIZXb/full>
- Peran Masyarakat Madani Dan Media Dalam Mengawal Prinsip Demokrasi Kunci Keberhasilan Pemulihan Dan Pasca Pandemi*. (2020 December 2021). | Portal Kementerian Luar Negeri Republik Indonesia. kemlu.go.id. <https://kemlu.go.id/portal/id/read/3158/view/peran-masyarakat-madani-dan-media-dalam-mengawal-prinsip-demokrasi-kunci-keberhasilan-pemulihan-dan-pasca-pandemi>
- Ramadhan, Devi Nindy Sari. (2021, October 25). *BNPB evaluasi hasil riset kebencanaan untuk kebijakan pulihkan Bali*. antaranews.com. <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/2479813/bnpb-evaluasi-hasil-riset>

Website

- Andrianto, R. (2022 March 08). *Dua Tahun Pandemi, Ekonomi Bali Ngenes Sekali...* CNBC Indonesia. <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20220308120609-4-320904/dua-tahun-pandemi-ekonomi-bali-ngenes-sekali>
- Asmara, C. G. (2020 March 11). *Pasien Pertama Positif Corona Meninggal di RSUP Sanglah Bali*. CNBC Indonesia. <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20200311155633-4-144129/pasien-pertama-positif-corona-meninggal-di-rsup-sanglah-bali>

kebencanaan-untuk-kebijakan-pulihkan-bali

- Ramadhian, Nabilla. (2021, June 8). *Apa Itu Work From Bali? Ini Penjelasan Lengkapnya*. KOMPAS.com. <https://travel.kompas.com/read/2021/06/08/123930227/apa-itu-work-from-bali-ini-penjelasan-lengkapnya?page=1>
- Samodro, D. (2020, May 15). *Kitabisa.com: Terkumpul RP130 Miliar Untuk Bantuan Covid-19*. Antara News. Retrieved November 24, 2022, from <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/1493376/kitabisacom-terkumpul-rp130-miliar-untuk-bantuan-covid-19>
- Virdhani, Marieska Harya. (2022, January 13). *Catatan Perjalanan Vaksinasi, Jokowi Jadi Orang Pertama Hingga Booster*. JawaPos.com. <https://www.jawapos.com/nasional/13/01/2022/catatan-perjalanan-vaksinasi-jokowi-jadi-orang-pertama-hingga-booster/>