

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

4.1 Conclusion

This research set out to answer the research question of “Why does Greenpeace Indonesia adopt particular advocacy strategies in its campaigns against Unilever’s greenwashing in Indonesia?” by discovering the factor behind Greenpeace Indonesia’s choice of campaign strategies in challenging Unilever’s greenwashing gambit. Through a qualitative descriptive approach and under the lens of Critical Theory and Collective Action Framing, this research explores how power dynamics shape Greenpeace Indonesia’s strategic choices and mobilization processes.

Chapter 2 provided the contextual groundwork for the analysis by examining Greenpeace Indonesia as a transnational environmental actor situated within Indonesia’s environmental and corporate landscape. It discussed the foundation of Greenpeace’s movement and campaign strategies, Indonesia’s environmental advocacy landscape, and Unilever’s market power in Indonesia’s FMCG dynamics. The chapter argued that Greenpeace Indonesia’s activism is shaped by both internal ideological commitments and external structural constraints, which later provides the foundational contextual basis to understand the backbone of Greenpeace’s calculated decisions in challenging Unilever.

Chapter 3 analyzed Greenpeace Indonesia’s advocacy strategies through the lenses of Critical Theory and Collective Action Framing. This chapter arguments are on two folds. First, Greenpeace Indonesia’s curated campaign

strategies in challenging Unilever is closely driven by the power structure asymmetry in both entities. Second, Greenpeace Indonesia's acts as a counter-hegemonic actor to fill the absence of such actor to challenge Unilever's hegemonic power in Indonesia. It examined how Greenpeace identifies environmental harm, assigns blame, proposes solutions, and mobilizes public support through strategic messaging and action. The chapter argued that Greenpeace adopts a dual strategy of confrontation and discursive framing to challenge Unilever's ideological control and maintain legitimacy in a constrained civic environment.

Generally, the findings reveal the imbalance of power structure role as a catalyst that leads Greenpeace in curating strategic approaches to challenge a greater power or challenger. The research underscores how Greenpeace contests hegemonic power relations embedded in neoliberal capitalism and global supply chains, fostering a collective action frame that shifts accountability onto corporate actors. Ultimately, Greenpeace Indonesia's multifaceted campaigns contribute to reshaping environmental discourse and advancing demands for systemic change in Indonesia's environmental governance.

4.2 Recommendation

While this research provides valuable insights into the dynamics of corporate environmentalism and activist resistance, several areas warrant further exploration. Future studies could investigate the long-term impacts of Greenpeace Indonesia's campaigns on Unilever's corporate policies and practices, assessing whether activist pressure translates into substantive environmental improvements.

Comparative research examining similar corporate-activist conflicts in other Southeast Asian countries could also enrich understanding of regional variations in environmental governance and social movement effectiveness.

Additionally, further inquiry into the role of digital media in sustaining environmental activism, particularly the mechanisms of online mobilization and counter-narrative construction, would deepen knowledge of contemporary campaign strategies. Exploring the perspectives of local communities affected by Unilever's operations could also provide a more nuanced understanding of grassroots engagement and the socio-environmental consequences of corporate practices. Such research would support the development of more effective strategies for environmental justice and corporate accountability in Indonesia and beyond.