Civil Society And Democracy In Asia : The Struggle Of Non-State Organizations In Expanding Democratic Space

M. Khusna Amal

Student of Doctoral Program in Social Science, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, Airlangga University, Surabaya

Abstract

Civil society and democracy are like two sides of a coin that is difficult to separate. There is no democracy without the presence of civil society, and there is no civil society that does not deal with democracy. Despite having a very close relationship, the relationship between the two does not necessarily lead to mutually reinforcing relationship, but it can also be mutually exclusive. The experience of Indonesia, Philippines and South Korea, shows that civil society organizations have become the main source of the reform movement and people power in pressing for change. However, the emergence and development of civil society in the post-reform in those three countries led to competition, conflict and internal divisions that have an unconstructive impact to the consolidation of democracy. Thus, civil society can be a trouble maker for the process of change and democratization.

Keywords: civil society, non-state organizations, public space, democracy, and Asia.

A.   Introduction

In 1990s[1], people in some Asian countries were actively involved in civil society movement in order to balance the state which was mostly dominated by authoritarian regimes. In the Philippines, the emergence of people power movement was triggered by affiliation of union, peasants, students, and the churches in order to fight against the authoritarian regime of Marcos (1986). In Indonesia, the reform movement was raised by affiliation of students, workers, peasants, and religious elite against the authoritarian regime of Suharto's New Order (1998). Meanwhile, an opposition movement which was an alliance of elements of civil society was born in South Korea in the struggle to delegitimize authoritarian regime (1987).

During its development, the dynamics of civil society in Asia showed a complex and unique phenomenon since civil society articulated by community in Asian countries was not exactly the same with the expression of civil society in the Western countries, especially Europe and Latin America. For sure, what was envisaged by Western society with its paradigm of civil society could be different from what was envisaged by people in Asian countries adopting this paradigm. According to Muthiah Alagappa, the dynamics of civil society in the countries of Asia brought out a diverse expression from time to time. Civil society in Asia showed characters that are not monotonous. They sometimes were very critical, reactive, radical, and militant in positioning themselves opposite (vis a vis) the state, but often, too, they positioned themselves holding hands and making out with the state[2].

Furthermore, this paper seeks to explore the dynamics of civil society and democratization in the three Asian countries (Indonesia, the Philippines, and Korea) from the window of the book "Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Democratic Sphere", edited by Muthiah Alagappa. As an anthology, this book contains the results of studies of a number of experts in the footsteps on civil society organizations in Asia in fostering political accountability, transparency, and participation. By reading this book, we will be able to understand the portrait of civil society in Asia and the role it does in fostering political change and democratization.

---

[1] Somewhat surprisingly, *civil society* is experiencing resurgence due to the rampant wave of democratization that swept Southern (Spain, Portugal and Greece) in the mid 1970s, Central and Latin America (Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Mexico, etc.) in the early 1980s, Eastern Europe (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Romania, Bulgaria and former east Germany) and some countries in Asia (South Korea, Taiwan, Philippines etc.) in the early1990s. This is the phenomenon which was called "the third wave of democratization" by Samuel P. Huntington, in between 1974 to 1990, at least 30 countries undergo transition to democracy. Read Samuel P. Huntington, *Democacy's Third Wave,* in Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner (ed.) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy,* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993, p. 3; Serif Mardin, *Civil Society and Islam*, dalam John A. Hall (ed.) *Civil Society: Theory, History,* Comparison, p. 278.

[2] Edward Aspinall, *Transformation of Civil Society and Democratic Breakthrough,* in Muthiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Democratis Space,* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2004, p., 73-85; read Andrew Arato, *Civil Society, Constitution, and Legitimacy,* Lahm, Md: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

B.   Civil Society and Democratization in Indonesia

1.   Old Order Era: The proliferation of Civil Society is not a guarantee for Democracy

In the Old Order era, the period of the 1950s to the 1960s, Indonesia was characterized by associational life in which various organizations and associations of civil society flourished. Unfortunately, associational life was mobilized and politicized by the political elite, which caused a sharp polarization. As often described by experts that the associational life of Indonesian society at that time was polarized into -borrowing Geertz term - aliran[1] (stream) politics. AT that time, almost no civil society organizations that were not affiliated with political parties - nationalist, religious, and communist[2]

As an implication, a huge conflict between civil societies and between civil society and the state occurred. Civil society was often used as a political vehicle, not to produce civilization and social capital but rather as an attraction in the socio-political conflict involving the masses to the grass roots. Therefore, it was not surprising that the civil society brought more harm (mudharat) than benefit (maslahat). Instead of encouraging political changes towards a more democratic way, civil society actually contributed to weaken the pillars of democracy (decline of democracy)[3].

In a note recorded by Aspinal, Indonesia under the Old Order regime (1950-1960) was characterized by conflict between civil societies and conflict occurring internally within civil societies which were accompanied by terrifying violence (read: human tragedy). Conflict in civil society[4] environment in turns involved the role of state regime which then emitted the conflict that was not only horizontal but also vertical in pattern. The contradiction between poor farmers (landless) who were mostly affiliated to the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) with the landlords who were mostly made up of Islamic scholars (ulema) and ulema's students affiliated to NU, had dragged military to take part in it. In that conflict, the PKI along with BTI made the slogan "war against seven village devils including ulema". In response, ulema and ulema's students countered it with a slogan "jihad against the atheist and communist"[5].

It was recorded that the conflict between elements of civil societies involving military role had generated a massive murder which was either committed by communists on ulema's students or otherwise, performed by ulema's students with military support on the communists. In September to October 1965, the PKI had staged a coup by kidnapping and killing six senior generals.   At the same time, military and NU also conducted a massive slaughter on PKI and its sympathizers. As many as 500,000 to one million people, mostly PKI members and sympathizers, were killed. This particular conflict which culminated in the events of 1965-1966 led to a political change from the Old Order to the New Order marked by the rise of Suharto[6] regime in which later on during his reign, his regime also generated a second volume of prototype of authoritarian regime.

2.   New Order Era: Civil Society was pressed, Civil Society survived,
and Civil Society fought

The birth of New Order with Suharto performed as the president of Indonesia could not be separated from a dark fragment of the history of aliran (stream) politics dispute which was full of violence. As the rise of Suharto, it was the military that practically controlled the government and then cut the chain of aliran (stream) politics and arranged the flow of political and social consensus using violent approach. The military leadership

---

[1] It was Clifford Geertz who first to introduced the term of *aliran* (stream) politics when observing politics in Indonesia after the independence of Indonesia. Geertz actually compared it with what he observed in the Netherlands, known as *Veruilen/Verzuiling*. *Aliran* (stream) which was a metaphor of the reality of socio-political life in Indonesia, where political parties in the post-independence period performed mass mobilization by establishing a number of *auxiliary organizations* in order to win the 1955 election. Read Afan Gaffar, *Politik Indonesia Transisi Menuju Demokrasi,* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2000, p., 125; Muhammad AS Hikam, *Islam, Demokratisasi & Pemberdayaan Civil Society,* Jakarta: Erlangga, 2000, p. 118-119.

[2] Noblemen or nationalist-secular affiliated to the Indonesian National Party (PNI), the Muslim modernist affiliated to Masjumi and PSII and traditionalist Muslims affiliated to NU, while many workers and peasants of the lower classes affiliated to the CPI. Robin Bush, *Nahdlatul Ulama and the Struggle for Power within Islam and Politics in Indonesia,* Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS), 2009,p., 9.

[3] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation.................,*p., 62-63.

[4] Conflict in civil society is a crucial part of the polarization of socio cultural and wider class, and its presence had also significantly contributed to the destruction of civilization and democratic policy. Edward Aspinall, *Transformation of Civil Society and Democratic Breakthrough,* in Muthiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political Change in Asia,*, p., 69.

[5] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation.................,* p., 67-68.

[6] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation.................,* p., 68-69.

was described by Richard Tanter as totaliran ambitions. In this context, the military controlling the country had an ambition to strengthen and expand state control over social life because the New Order were worried about the memory of bloody conflict as happened in the event of 1965-1966[1].

In the New Order era, civil society was grouped into three categories, namely, First, a legal entity single organization, such as farmer organizations joining HKTI (Indonesian Farmers Harmony Association). HKTI is an organization that has a dependency on the government and also has affiliation to Golkar. Second, semi-corporatist organization, an independent organization in the origin and aspirations, but it compromises with the state in order to survive. NU and Muhammadiyah are the examples of this organization. Third, proto-oppositional civil society organization, the organization that has significant independence away from state intervention, but it occasionally adopts a critical opinion against the policies and actions conducted by the state. Organizations included in this category include non-governmental organizations engaging in law reform (LBH), environmental protection, and alternatives development for a particular community[2].

Meanwhile, associational life during the New Order era was marked by two important trends. The First was the blur of the boundaries between state and civil society. This vagueness is a product of the state's central role in creating civilian life restructuring and state intervention against legal organizations. As a result, challenges to the New Order was characterized by what XL Ding described as "institutional amphibiousness", where formal or semi-officially institutions were used for the purpose of conducting counter to the goals shared by these institutions. The most obvious example was that at the beginning of the 1990s, there were attempts from modernist Islamic groups who wanted to colonize the country from within through the Association of Indonesian Muslim Intellectuals (ICMI) lead by BJ Habibie and it was also sponsored by Soeharto himself[3].

The second characteristic of the civil society of New Order era was the defensive character. There were not many NGOs facing a very repressive New Order regime that overtly performed control and resistance to the state regime. Such defensiveness was also clearly demonstrated by NU. Since the 1970s, NU has been known as an organization that has a relationship that often takes the opposite side from the state that has been judged to repress the lives of Muslims. In 1984, this organization indicated a change in building relationships with the government, moreover when NU became a pioneer organization accepting Pancasila as the state ideology. Since then, the relationship between NU and the state has increasingly soften and has indicated their closeness. Consequently, the State has allocated more attention and many development programs to NU pesantren[4].

At the end of the 1990s, civil society could institutionally be said to increasingly weaken. Various elements of civil society had different views about the ideal society. As a consequence, these groups set different goals and different steps of struggle. In addition, the civil society groups in this period also depended not only on the external founding but also on the support from the state to maintain its existence[5].

However, one thing that is important to note is that the repression of the New Order authoritarian regime in the long term did not directly knock out the power of civil society. Tremendous pressure in a certain momentum has led to a mass explosion to fight against the regime of authoritarian state. 1998 reform movement in Indonesia managing to overthrow the authoritarian New Order regime represents the problem. Similar case of people power occurred in the Philippines succeeding in overthrowing the authoritarian regime of Ferdinand Marcos. This is where the existence of a civil society was understood as one of the anchors and motors for the political changes in some countries of Asia, especially in Indonesia, from the era of authoritarianism to democratic transition era[6].

C. Civil Society dan Democratization in the Philippines
1. People Power/ EDSA Revolution 1

Marcos dictatorship lasted for 20 years. And for 20 years, the Marcos regime tended to develop a hegemonic system of government with its main characters were dominating, repressive, and exploitative, without

---

[1] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation...................,* p., 71.

[2] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation.................,* p., 71-72.

[3] Relationally, Suharto support on ICMI was a political strategy in playing Islamic cards by confronting Islamic conservative groups with moderate and liberal civil Islamic group supporting democracy. Instead of trying to co-opt the mainstream of Islam, Suharto chose to exert his energy to Islamic conservative group in order to sell patronage in return for their help in reducing the opposition. Robert W. *Civil Islam, Islam dan Demokratisasi di Indonesia,* Yogyakarta: LKiS, 2001, p., 281; Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation......................* p., 72-73.

[4] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation.................,* p., 73-74.

[5] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation.................,* p., 74-77.

[6] Edward Aspinal, *Indonesia Transformation.................,* p., 89.

giving many spaces for the growth of freedom of speech and association. On the one hand, political repression constructed by Marcos, indeed succeeded in creating compliance and submission, and it was able to control and suppress any resistance movement to counter government. On the other hand, political repression was not always able to create adherence without reserve, whereas, it could produce a counter hegemonic movement of all elements of the civilian masses. This kind of socio-political situation was identified by many parties as the trigger of the emergence of power- people movement driven by the strength of civil society in the 1980s[1].

The event was started with the murder of Sen. Benigno Aquino (1983). Two million people drove the bodies to the cemetery. After that, between 1983-1986, Manila was hit by massive protests against the Marcos dictatorship led by, among other, Corazon Aquino. As the situation worsened, Marcos announced in November 1985 that elections would be held in 1986. He was confident enough to win the election because he had everything (money, power, weapons). Elections were finally successfully implemented. But soon after the election, protest wave against fraud in the form of voice manipulation committed by Marcos was emerged. The situation heated up when the representative of the army, Staff Gen. Fidel Ramos and Juan Ponce Enrille Menhann defected and claimed that the real election winner was Corazon Aquino[2].

At that moment, Jaime Cardinal Sin through Veritas radio asked his people to protect the two military leaders. Thousands of people made up of masses from all walks of life namely the political elite, the middle class, business people, students, workers, and religious elite (the Catholic Church) went down the street to meet at Epifano de Dos Santos Avenue (EDSA) to take the fight against the Marcos dictatorship, corruption, fraud, collusion and nepotism. This was then known as a people power movement or EDSA revolution that succeeded in forcing Marcos to step down as president.

2. People Power/ EDSA Revolution 2

The success of people power 1 in toppling the authoritarian regime did not directly guarantee the establishment of the socio-political system that was truly democratic. Evidently, after the Philippine people power movement that was at the transition phase, for some time it managed to hold a democratic election where Aquino - the motor movement of people power - was selected as the winner. During this Aquino administration, elements of civil society in guarding the democratic government had been fragmented into various groups. They did not have the same views and interests related to the development of democracy. It later also sparked interest in the differences and conflicts between elements of civil society[3].

Philippine socio-political conditions continued to decline in line with Estrada victory in the elections. In the era of the Estrada administration, the political system in the Philippines could be said to have a setback, returning to the path of authoritarianism. Political system which was not aspirational to the interests of the people was what triggers Philippine society to protest. The protests continuing to spread in turn was able to bring back people power movement volume 2 which was also led by elements of civil society. People power movement volume 2 as people power volume 1- managed to subvert the Estrada regime and gave birth to a new leader Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo through the election[4].

In the successive development, the dynamics of civil society in building power relation with the state or the agenda of political change, almost the same as Indonesia, experienced ups and downs. Arroyo who had become a representation of people power 2 movement, at the beginning of her reign was still considered quite democratic. However, in a successive period, the Arroyo administration showed less democracy in character. The issue of corruption, collusion and nepotism once again spread in the Arroyo administration. It also raised the uproar of people power movement volume 3. However, Filipino people seemed to get fed up with people power movement. They question whether the political change in the Philippines will always be done in ways of people power movement.

D. Civil Society and Democratization in South Korea
1. Historical Path of Civil Society Movement

Traces of the history of oppositional movements of civil society in South Korea could be traced to the period of Japanese colonialism starting in 1910 until 1945. One of the consequences of Japanese colonialism was the emergence of formation and consolidation of a conflict mode between the state and civil society. Japanese imperialism had created a powerful colonial state in dealing with the Korean people. Colonial Korean government had unlimited power to overcome the legislative, judiciary, administration, military. In addition, it also had a stronger and better organization than the original Korean pre-colonial system of government, the

---

[1] Jennifer C. Franco, *The Philippines, Factious Civil Society.................,* p., 106-109.
[2] Jennifer C. Franco, *The Philippines, Factious Civil Society....................,* p., 106-109
[3] Jennifer C. Franco, *The Philippines, Factious Civil Society....................,,* p., 109-111
[4] Jennifer C. Franco, *The Philippines, Factious Civil Society......................,* p., 109-111

monarchy system. At the same time, Japanese imperialism was famous for its resistance, militancy and opposition to the civil society[1].

When Japan suffered a setback in August 1945, the Japanese colonial state in Korea did not automatically stop. Japanese authorities gave Yo Un Hyong to immediately form the Preparatory Committee for Establishing a New State, hereinafter referred to Konjun, in order to substitute the Japanese state apparatus. In two weeks, the preparatory committee successfully established 145 local offices. On 8 September 1945, the People's Republic of Korea was established. In forming various organizations in order to put back the structure of the colonial state, the preparatory committee established a new state to accommodate the explosive expansion of civil society at the time. After a period of Japanese colonialism, the workers and peasants formed a social organization. Furthermore, a number of social groups representing students, youth, women, cultural activists, and religious elements were also formed[2].

It was noteworthy that the communists played an instrumental role in the social organization. Korean communists, many of whom appeared as the head of a underground struggle movement against Japanese imperialism during the colonial period to form the Communist Party of Korea (Choson Kongsandang) on 11 September 1945. The party played an important role in organizing the National Council of Labor Unions (Chonp'yong) and the National Federation of Peasant Unions (Chonnong) in late 1945. Other important roles performed by The Communist Party of Korea were, among others, the initiative to organize the Korean Democratic Youth Federation (Minch'ong), the National Women 's Union (Puch'ong), the Communist Youth Federation (Kongch'ong), the Writers' Alliance (Munhakka Tongmaeng), and the Scientists' Alliance (Kwahakcha Tongmaeng). On 15 February 1946, the number of various social organizations reached 35. These civil society groups were not directly under the influence and control of the communists. During this period, civil society groups were characterized by high levels of functionality and their autonomy[3].

The advent of military rule under U.S. armed forces in Korea brought its own disaster for civil society development. Military government adopted many unfavorable policies for civil society groups. For example, the government had put an end to the dominance of social organizations growing from the bottom and dramatically changed the political landscape of Korea. To break the closeness of the relationship between civil society and communism, the American military government systematically repressed and depoliticized the civil society. Faced with this situation, civil society groups led by the National Council of Labor Unions and the National Federation of Peasant Unions responded to the oppressive policy of the American military government by performing demonstrations and harsh resistance. The American military government responded to the movement repressively by using approaches and policies of the Cold War[4].

In successive developments (mid 1980), South Korea fell back into the system of government that was not democratic. The Constitution was amended to eliminate the restrictions on presidential power, executive took dominant positions over legislative and the judiciary, the election was no longer running free and fair, the interest groups only became the representatives of the government, and the existence of the mass media was monitored and strictly controlled by the state. In the mid -1980s as well, elements of liberal democracy one more time assumed a new and real meaning. A ruling party leader, Roh Tae Woo, filed eight democratization packages that adopted many of the demands of the opposition parties and social movement groups. As a result, a number of significant changes have appeared in Korean politics since 1987. Further impact, civil liberties significantly spread throughout the country, contestation of election was held fairly, and civilian control over the military became stronger. In line with the expansion of freedom and civil powers, South Korea made it through the transition from authoritarian to democratic policies, and even became one of the Asian countries that were able to consolidate democracy.

2. Civil Society, Transition, and Consolidation of Democracy

The dynamics of politics in South Korea can be divided into three periods, namely the period at which an authoritarian regime collapse, the period of the emergence of democratic transition, and the period of co-optation of the U.S. military. Those periods have been ongoing since 1948: 1956-1961; 1973-1980, and 1984-

---

[1] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, in Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political..................,* p., 140.

[2] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, in Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political..................,* p., 140.

[3] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, in Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political..................,* p., 141.

[4] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, in Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political..................,* p., 142.

1987. In the three periods, civil society groups were considered to have contributed greatly to the break of the authoritarian and gave birth to the era of democratic transition. In the first democratic period (1956-1961), college students and urban intellectuals fought against repression and corruption performed by the authoritarian regime of Syngman Rhee. Students along with progressive opposition parties also undertook democratic campaign. In the second democratic period (1973-1980), a national association comprised of intellectuals, journalists, professionals and religious leaders played an important role in the fight against the authoritarian of Park Chung Hee regime. While in the third period of democracy, pro-democracy civil society alliance got support from the middle class comprising of students, workers, and churches. Civil society groups were united by a national association involving a number of regional and national organizations. The existence of civil society was stronger with a wider scope and more systematic efforts in fighting against the authoritarian regime and in negotiating the demands of democracy for which they fought[1].

State repression against civil society under the Chun Doo Hwan regime lasted for four years (1980-1983)[2]. Along with the military coup and the violence against pro-democracy movement in Kwangju in May 1980, the authoritarian regime conducted a purge of elements of society by arresting thousands of public officials, politicians, professors, teachers, priests, journalists and students on the basis of allegations of corruption, the suggestion of anti-government demonstrations, and insurgency effort[3].

At the end of 1983, Chun repression against civil society significantly reduced. Authoritarian regime decided to liberalize policies to provide opportunities for professors and students to return to campus, withdrew the military police from the campus, and rehabilitated political prisoners. Chun government's new policy had taken back the resurgence of civil society. In that period also, the opposition politicians formed the New Korea Democratic Party (NKDP: Sinhan Minjundang) in January 1985. Authoritarian politics fell and transition to democracy began to blossom, especially, characterized by the emergence of NKDP formations along with its constituents and juxtaposition with civil society groups[4].

Meanwhile, pro-democracy movement in South Korea taking place during 1986-1987 took three different forms. First, starting at the beginning of 1986, religious activists set an issue of declarations slur against the authoritarian regime and demanded the revision of legislative quickly. The Protestant Pastor made a statement in March 1986 explaining that the bottom line was that the drafting of the constitution guaranteeing the presidential election, the most basic human rights, and economic justice was essentially required. Cardinal Kim Su Hwan at the beginning of May 1986 also announced that democratization was the best way to make peace with God. Second, opposition groups of NKPD launched a popular campaign to collect ten million signatures to support the making of the revised legislative. Third, civil society groups together with NKDP sponsored a mass public meeting in encouraging democratization. Great democratic coalition of civil society groups and opposition parties successfully mobilized Korean citizens from all walks of life - students, workers, peasants, religious leaders, and other citizens - under the slogan "take down authoritarian military regimes and arise democratic governance"[5].

Finally, on June 29, 1987, mass mobilization on a large scale met at almost every corner of the region in South Korea and the authoritarian regimes announced a quite dramatic and unpredictable concession to meet the demands of civil society groups and opposition parties. The government also agreed to the demands of civil society groups to hold direct presidential election system. As the case in Taiwan and the Philippines, various civil society groups in South Korea has played a crucial role in breaking down authoritarian regimes and uncovering the birth of an era of transition to democracy[6].

---

[1] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, inMutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political.................,* p., 143.

[2] Between the years 1980-1983, there were virtually no real opposition groups in the South Korean politics. Opposition parties such as the Democratic Party of Korea (Minhandang) and the Nationalist Party of Korea (Kungmindang) were tightly controlled by authoritarian regimes. Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, in Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political.................,* p., 145.

[3] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, inMutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political.................,* p., 143-144.

[4] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, dalam Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political.................,* p., 145.

[5] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, in Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political.................,* p., 146.

[6] Sunhyuk Kim, *South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions*, in Mutiah Alagappa, *Civil Society and Political.................,* p., 147.

E.   Closing Remarks

From the explanation mentioned above, one can draw the conclusion that (1) civil society in Asia had diverse characteristics, moderate, liberal, and even radical. Civil society groups with their diverse ideological - political tendencies showed a characteristics of dynamic, fluctuant, sometimes very critical, aloof and even directly face to face with the state when in contact with the state and the market, but they also often made out and held hands with the state, (2) the development and growth of civil society in Asia brought two consequences at once, a blessing and a disaster for democracy, (3) civil society in Asia could play an important role in encouraging democratic political change and it greatly depended on the condition of the domestic (national) and at the same international conditions. When both factors were conducive, the role of civil society in pushing political change would work well; (4) theoretically, civil society movements in Asian countries were influenced by two prominent thought namely the Gramscian and Neo-Tocquevillean. Those two perspectives seemed to have a strong influence in the country of South Korea, Philippines, and Indonesia.

References

Alagappa, Muthiah. 2004. Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Space Democratic. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Arato, Andrew. 2000. Civil Society, Constitution, and Legitimacy. Lahm, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.

Aspinall, Edward. 2004. "Transformation of Civil Society and Democratic Breakthrough", in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.), Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Democratis Space. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Bush, Robin. 2009. Nahdlatul Ulama and the Struggle for Power within Islam and Politics in Indonesia. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS).

Franco, Jennifer C. 2004. The Philippines, Factious Civil Society, in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Space Democratic. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gaffar, Afan. 2000. Politik Indonesia Transisi Menuju Demokrasi. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. The Selections From the Prison Notebooks. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, John A. 1995. In Search of Civil Society, dalam Johan A. Hall (ed.) Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparasion. Cambridge, Massachussets: Polity Press.

Haynes, Jeff. 2000. Demokrasi & Masyarakat Sipil di Dunia Ketiga: Gerakan Politik Baru Kaum Terpinggirkan. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Hefner, Robert W. 2001. Civil Islam, Islam dan Demokratisasi di Indonesia. Yogyakarta: LKiS.

Hikam, Muhammad AS. 2000. Islam, Demokratisasi & Pemberdayaan Civil Society. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. Democacy's Third Wave, dalam Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner (ed.) The Global Resurgence of Democracy. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kim, Sunhyuk. 2004. South Korea: Confrontational Legacy Democratic Contributions, in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Space Democratic. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Mardin, Serif. "Civil Society and Islam", dalam John A. Hall (ed.) Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

Recent conferences: http://www.iiste.org/conference/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar