

**Does local governments' responsiveness increase with decentralization and democratization?
Evidence from sub-national budget allocation in Indonesia***

Krisztina Kis-Katos*

Bambang Suharnoko Sjahrir*

University of Freiburg, Department of International Economic Policy

March 2012

Abstract

We investigate the effects of Indonesian decentralization and democratization on budget allocation at the sub-national level. Based on panel data for 271 Indonesian districts over 13 years, we address the determinants of local investment expenditures in education, health and infrastructure. We find that local governments' responsiveness increased with decentralization considerably: districts with relatively lower levels of public service delivery increased their investments by relatively more after decentralization. We find that fiscal and administrative decentralization had a clear impact on local budget allocation while there is no evidence for additional improvements in responsiveness of local governments due to the political decentralization and democratization process. Our evidence reflects thus improvements in local targeting irrespective of the strength of the political competition at the local level.

JEL classification: H72, H75

*Under Revision: Please contact authors for more information

* University of Freiburg, Germany, Platz der Alten Synagoge 1, 79085 Freiburg.

Email: bambang.sjahrir@vwl.uni-freiburg.de, krisztina.kis-katos@vwl.uni-freiburg.de.

This research has been supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research under the grant no. 01UC0906. We would like to thank Christian von Lübke for sharing the data on the timing of direct elections and the World Bank team in Jakarta for help with the data and helpful discussions. We are also grateful to Günther G. Schulze and seminar participants at the University of Freiburg for helpful comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are ours.

Paper 3

The Reinvention of Democracy through Communitarian Vision: the case of Communitarian Democracy Movement in Thailand

Thorn Pitidol

DPhil candidate in Social Policy, University of Oxford

thorn.pitidol@spi.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper uncovers the effects that the notion of community can have over the vision of democratic participation when the two concepts are combined together. The tension that is not easily recognisable between the vision of community and the freedom of individuals is highlighted through the case of the Communitarian Democracy movement in Thailand. It is shown through the case study that the assimilation between the concept of community and democracy can be highly problematic, as the communitarian vision can subvert democratic participation into the space that its existence is expected to serve the fulfilment of communitarian virtues. More importantly, this subversion comes at a cost of neglecting the freedom of people who do not hold or belong to the vision.

Introduction

The concept of community is attractive. It is a feel good concept that touches upon various desires, ranging from desires for unity to security, to harmony and autonomy (Bauman, 2001). The notion of community is often combined with other concept such as participation or development in order to extend its relevance and value. Yet, there has been inadequate exploration into the relationships between the notion of community and the concepts they are combined with. This paper looks into these relationships, problematising particularly the assimilation between the concept of community and democracy. It does so through a case study of a social movement in Thailand is called the "Communitarian Democracy" movement, which has been mobilising for the alternative form of democratic participation based on the virtues of the Thai communities. The paper examines how, in the context of Thailand's democratic crisis since the mid 2000, the notion of democratic participation was reinvented by the movement. The paper also considers the democratic credentials of such reinvented vision.

This paper aims to unravel the following questions; what are the important features and the main characteristics of the notion of community in the Thai context; how has the notion of community, in the context of the Communitarian Democracy movement, shaped the construction of the alternative vision of democratic participation; and what effects does the vision of community have on the vision of democratic participation? Each of the three sections in this paper deals with each of these questions respectively. The first section of the paper explains and characterises the notion of community in Thailand, particularly in relation to its development sector. The focus of this section is to provide a better understanding of the nature of the notion of community, by conceptualising it as a symbolic construction. The second section builds on the first section by exploring the influences of the notion of community in relation to the Communitarian Democracy movement, examining how it shaped a vision of democratic participation that rests on the rejection of the electoral system. Finally, the third section analyses this communitarian-guided vision of democratic participation, in order to unravel the effects that the vision of community has on the communitarians' desired form of participation. This final section argues that communitarian vision can subvert democratic participation to become simply the process that serves the communitarians' vision of the common good, and therefore, crowding out of the role of democratic participation as the space for exercises individuals' freedom.

Section 1: Thailand's community culture discourse

This section gives a brief outline of the vision of community that has been dominant in Thailand, especially in the development context, which is called the Community Culture Discourse (CCD). The section outlines the CCD's main characteristics, and subsequently explains how the CCD can be better understood as a symbolic construction, through the insights from A.P.Cohen's concept of the "Symbolic Construction of Community" (Cohen, 1985).

Although highly influential and popular, it is difficult to give the CCD a specific description. The core perspective of the discourse lies in the understanding of the Thai rural development problems as being caused by the loss of the virtuous culture of Thai communities in the past, and the recognition of the solution to lie in the revival of such culture. Yet, the range of meanings that the CCD can be associated with is highly pervasive. The CCD has been associated with various development concepts and practices, for example; the concepts of

localism and community self-reliance, and the practices of community-based management of natural resources, micro-finances, conservation of traditions, and organic farming.

The CCD emerged and became popular at first within the Thai NGOs sector. In its early days, it was recognised as the practical guideline for the NGOs' works that put the emphasis on the value of local cultures as means to promoting development (Yukti, 1995). The subsequent writings on the discourse by the prominent Thai NGOs figures helped systemised the CCD. In general, these writings portrayed the livelihood problems faced by the Thai farmers as arising from the process of modernisation that had been forced upon by the Thai state (ibid). The discourse portrays any development process, including one introduced by the Thai state, that is associated with modernisation, urbanisation, industrialisation, and globalisation as harmful to the rural farmers. While development process based on characteristics seen as the opposite, such as traditions, rurality, agriculture, and Thainess, is recognised as benign. In addition, the state and the market were seen as the exploitative systems; and therefore, the CCD rejects the roles of the state and market in favor of community's self-determination and self-reliance. Contributing to the focus on self-determination and self-reliance by communities was the perspective that such qualities were prevalent among the Thai villages in the past. The characterisation of the Thai villages in the past as being predominantly self-reliance was put forward in the works of the Thai political economist called Chattip Natsupha (see for example, Chattip, 1999), and became the main reference model for the subsequent developments of the CCD.

In the 1990s, the CCD attracted significant popularity at the national level, thanks to the growing influences of the NGOs leading figures in the time of democratisation. Yet, the most important development of the discourse occurred when King Bhumibhol gave the speech on his idea of "self-sufficiency economy", arguing for moderation and self-reliance as the main philosophy of development for the Thais. Since then, the notion of self-reliance that was proposed by the CCD was developed into a royally endorsed concept. Through the association with the concept of self-sufficiency economy, the CCD developed close association with Thai nationalism, gaining power mainly from the dominant ideology of Royalism. In addition, the recent development of the CCD also saw it being associated with the concept of rights. This is highlighted in the emergence and growth in popularity of the concept "Community Rights", which argues for the achievements of the CCD's vision of development to be recognised as a

“rights”. The associations between the CCD and other concepts demonstrate one of its crucial natures, which is the vagueness that allows it to be assimilated fluidly with other concepts.

The CCD as the symbolic construction

Much of the academic discussions of the CCD centered on the issues related to its accuracy in the depiction of reality, both in the present and in the past. The Thai rural villages, as pointed out by several studies, was and has always been substantively integrated with trade networks and the state's administrative system (see for example, Bowie 1992; Rigg and Sukunee 2001; Kemp, 1991). Yet, the crucial nature of the CCD may lie elsewhere from its claim to accurately reflect reality. The CCD is more of a normative vision, an ethical construction (Hewison, 2000, Anan, 2001). In addition, as already stated, it is also endowed with the vagueness that allows it to be associated with different meanings. Any good understanding of the CCD, therefore, needs to capture and explain these two crucial features of the concept.

A.Walker proposed that a better understanding of the notion community in the context of rural Thailand can be gained by adopting insights from A.P.Cohen's concept of "the Symbolic Construction of Community" (Walker, forthcoming). This paper built upon this suggestion in its conceptualisation of the CCD, as it recognises that Cohen's conceptualisation is helpful in explaining the CCD's normativity and vagueness. Community, in Cohen's perspective, is a social construction that is collectively imagined. It is a “symbolically constructed notion”, a repertoire of symbols that allows its adherents to attain collective identity from engagements with it. Such instrumental role of the concept in allowing its adherents to attain their sense of identity underpins the concept's normativity. The concept also possesses the symbolic nature, which makes it productive of meanings. This is because symbols can be interpreted differently by different users. The symbolic nature of the concept allows those who uses the concept to gain from it diverse meanings that are valuable to each of them (Cohen, 1985:15-21, 71-75). This symbolic nature underlies the vagueness of the concept of community.

The role in marking the value of collective identity is central to the concept of community. In the case of the CCD, the type of identity that the notion of community is mobilised to assert is the identity of development agents. Such identity, as explained by Olivier De Sardan as "development populism", is one in which the agents see themselves as the defenders or saviour of the weak. The relationship that is central to such identity is one in which

development agents “discover the people, pity their lot in life and marred with their capacities, and decide to put themselves at the disposal of the people and strive for their welfare” (Olivier De Sardan, 2005:35). The symbolic construction of the CCD can be recognised as the effort by development agents to mark this type of identity.

For the proponents of the CCD, the symbolic construction of community is pursued through the uses of symbols to mark the boundaries that separate the "good" and the "bad" vision of development, and in the uses of the model of reality to function as the reference for the good vision. Symbols that mark the boundaries are devices that are used to mark the distinction of a particular identity from others (Cohen, 1985:39-40). They usually exist in oppositional categories; ones that identify with users' identity and the opposing ones that identify the others. The CCD's symbols of boundaries include the aforementioned oppositional categories of modernity/tradition, urbanity/rurality, industrialisation/agriculture, and globalisation/Thainess. Visions of development relate to tradition, rurality, and agriculture are good ideals of development that is pursued by the good developers, while the opposing symbols simply represent the opposite.

In addition to the symbols that mark the boundary, another set of symbols functions as the model of reality. These symbols construct the projected reality as the basis for the communitarian vision, usually through the construction of a collective history. These symbols are associated with the invented myth of the past glory that lends enchantment and rightness to the constructed ideal of community. In the case of the CCD, such symbols are the portrayal of different aspects of the Thai village in the past. These symbols give charm and the authority to the CCD. The timelessness of its depiction of the past performs an important symbolic function, allowing people to connect with the vision more easily, presenting their present as continuity from the depicted picture of the past.

The vision of community is constantly being reconstructed, especially in the context where the vision is being threatened by social changes (Cohen, 1985:44-49). In case of the CCD, changes associated with industrialization and globalization often led to the reassertion of vision's value. The following section will explain how process of symbolic construction of the CCD occurred in response to the recent political changes of Thailand.

Section 2: The Communitarian Democracy movement

The section explores how the CCD influenced the visioning of the alternative form of democratic participation through examining the Communitarian Democracy movement, which was mobilised by the CCD proponents in the context of Thailand's democratic crisis. The movement started from the series of seminars that criticised the electoral system as the root cause of the corruption and the conflicts. The movement, in the post 2006 coup period, subsequently developed into the movement calling for the setting up of a local political institution called the Council of Community Organisation (CCO).

The context of Thailand's democratic crisis

The context of Thailand's democratic crisis was the condition that propelled the CCD proponents to propose their alternative form of democratic participation. Developments of Thai politics before and during the crisis created conditions where the CCD proponent's communitarian vision was marred by a different reality.

Thailand's political conflict, in general, arose out of the divergence of preferences in politics between the two main groups; the rural-based supporters of the ex-Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra, and the urban-based middle and upper class opponents of Thaksin. The democratisation of Thailand in the 1990s paved way for the rural masses to become a major force in electoral politics, by reducing the military influence and strengthening the stability of the parliament system (Hewison, 2010). Thaksin's Thai Rak Thai party capitalised on this development, building their popularity among the rural poor, and achieved a long period of domination over Thai politics during 2000-2006. Such domination, however, endured a major obstacle when the urban middle class mobilised against him shortly after his landslide victory in the 2004 election. The corruption allegations, conflict of interests, and most importantly, the allegation of his lack of loyalty to the King, all played an important part in the emergence and growth of the movement. The movement eventually developed into the People Alliance for Democracy (PAD) movement. As the movement evolved, the PAD turned increasingly toward the uses of Nationalist and Royalist themes in their mobilisation. This is signified by the use of the yellow color, the color of the King, as their symbol, and the labeling of their movement as the "fight for the King".

Significant part the Thai development NGOs, which majority of them were also the CCD proponents, was one of the major force of the PAD (Nelson: 2007). Interestingly, their support to the PAD was not recognised as contradicting with their position as the defenders of the poor and the weak. Playing a crucial role in this neglect was their perception of the poor as being misled by the corrupting influences of Thaksin. The instrument that Thaksin employed to lure the poor out of their self-reliance path toward becoming his client is the pro-poor policies, which were branded as “populist policies” in order to highlight their role simply as means for Thaksin to gain popularity. The perception of rural people as prone to vote buying, as they are embedded in the local patron-client relationship, also played an important part in the degradation of the rural poor's participation in election (Walker, 2008). Their votes were immoralised simply as the actions in exchange for monetary benefits. Seeing developments in Thai politics as going against their vision, the CCD proponents were urged to reassert the value of their identity and the CCD in the political arena, eventually resulting in the Communitarian Democracy movement.

The Communitarian Democracy movement

During their movement against Thaksin, the CCD proponents gathered together to organise a series of seminars on the topic of “Harmony Politics” (CSM, 2006). What is meant by “harmony” in these seminars, however, was not really about promoting harmony with Thaksin, but the harmony that was lost because of him. The organisers of these seminars and their main speakers included widely respected NGO figures and public intellectuals such as Prawase Wasi, Paiboon Wattanasiritham, and Chatchawal Thongdeelert.

It is in the “Harmony Politics” seminars that the concept of "Communitarian Democracy" was put forward by the CCD proponents. Recognising that Thaksin's legitimacy rested on the elections he had won, they identified the electoral system as the root cause of political problems that Thailand was facing. They attempted to symbolically construct the electoral system as the system opposed to the ideal of the CCD. The electoral system was constructed as an immoral political system, and the opposing system called “Communitarian Democracy” was constructed as a moral ideal of politics. The elections system was portrayed as immoral because it always contains vote buying and the immoral-corrupted politicians (Prawase, 2006; Chatchawal, 2006). More importantly, the speakers argued that the most crucial problem with the electoral system is that it leads to conflict and rivalry, and thus, destroys the harmony in

communities (Chatchawal, 2006). The electoral system was also portrayed as an alien system to the authentic pre-existing political system of Thai communities. Electoral system was labelled the “Western system” that is unsuitable to Thailand, cutting the Thais from their cultural roots (ibid.). An alternative system to election, called Communitarian Democracy, was presented as the political system based on harmonious relationship of people within the Thai community. Communitarian Democracy, they argued, was the political system based on the Thai community culture of self-reliance, collectiveness, and unity (CSM, 2006). It was argued that each culture has its own type of democracy, and therefore, Communitarian Democracy is the Thai type of democracy

The speakers at the Harmony Politics seminars argued that, in the system of Communitarian Democracy, leaders should not come from elections, but from another system base on community culture (ibid). Such system already existed in the past in Thai communities. It was argued that, in the past, community members had always been working collectively and living together in harmony and unity. Community members, therefore, always had a consensus on who should be their leaders. In this system, they argued, there is no need for elections; the choosing of leaders can be done simply by allowing community members to deliberate, and the consensus on who will be the leader will be attained (Prawase, 2006; Chatchawal, 2006). Leaders from such process were lauded as the “natural leaders”. The speakers argued that the “natural leaders” will be moral and will help steer their communities toward the CCD pathway of development, promoting the virtues of self-reliance and self-determination.

The 2006 Coup provided the proponents of the ideal Communitarian Democracy with a precious opportunity. The military Junta chose one of their leading figures, Paiboon Watanasiritham, to be the Minister of Social Development and Human Security (MOSD). This provided the proponents of the ideal of Communitarian Democracy a chance to turn their vision into reality. They started a movement for the promulgation of a law that supported an establishment of a new local institution along their vision called the Council of Community Organisation (CCO), which is to be formed by the CCO Act. Much of the rationales provided for the promulgation of the CCO Act were based on the concept of Communitarian Democracy. However, notably in the movement for the CCO Act was the movement adoption concepts such as “rights”, “participation”, and most importantly, “direct democracy” to support their vision of Communitarian Democracy.

The CCO Act was argued to be a progressive vehicle toward genuine democracy. It was argued that, through the CCOs, “community rights” will be better protected (Son, 2007; CODI, 2007a). The CCO Act will protect the fundamental rights of the community, which is the "right to determine their own future in all aspects". Such rights, it was emphasized, were lost because of the electoral system. In addition, the CCO Act was argued to be the instrument for promoting “local participation” (CODI, 2007a; Pensri, 2007). It was argued that, through the CCOs, every members of a community will be able to participate; communities will be able to determine their course own development based on their local way of life and local wisdom, independent from the control of the central government (Son, 2007). The most importantly argument used to support the CCO Act, perhaps, was the association of the CCO Act with the promotion of “direct democracy” (CODI, 2007b). Such argument portrayed the CCO as means for promoting direct democracy: a better form of democracy that is not limited to elections. It is direct democracy that is built on, and will promote, community culture. It was argued that the CCOs will transform communities, turning their members from people who expect government support into the people who are self-reliance (ibid). Moreover, it was pledged by the proponents of the CCO Act that the CCO will give at least a “legal status” to the COs, which will help the COs negotiate better with the government and gain more acceptances from the public (Prachatai, 2007a.). The movement for the CCO Act was able to gain supports from many academics and activists (Prachathai, 2007b.). The CCO Act was approved by the National Legislation Assemblies (NLA), the junta-chosen parliament, in October 2007. The law came into effect since the early 2008.

Section 3: The reinvention of democracy through communitarian vision

"In short, 'community' stands for the kind of world which is not, regrettably, available to us. But which we would dearly wish to inhabit and which we hope to repossess. Community is nowadays another name for paradise lost -but one which we dearly hope to return, and so we feverishly seek the roads that may bring us there"
(Bauman, 2001:3)

This final section recaptures the essence of the prior sections, and analyses the implications of the symbolic construction of community on the type of democratic participation that is reinvented through it. As explained by Bauman in the above sentences, community is the

notion that carries with it good feelings as it represents things we miss, what we lack to be secure, confident, and trusting. This paper looks into the nature of the notion, particularly in the context of its usages in development. The vision of community, as argued in this paper, fulfils not just the search for security. In the development context, the notion of community is symbolically constructed in the attainment of the populist identity. This identity, as explained earlier, is the identity of ones who seeks to bring about the ending to the suffering of the poor or the disadvantage.

In the case study of Thailand, such vision of community is represented by the picture of the self-reliance and self-sufficient Thai village. The idealistic picture, however, contrasted with the actual conditions. It is not too difficult to recognise that the reality of changes in most society usually drifts away from the vision of community, and this also applies to the Thai case. Yet, this divergence from the vision, instead of reducing the vision's relevance, brings more significance and desire to it. As Bauman noted, "on this difference, the imagined community feeds and thrives" (Bauman, 2001:4). As changes are threatening the vision, the need is perceived even more to reassert its value. The context of democratic crisis in Thailand brought about the tide of change where the vision of community intersects with the issue of democratic participation. Underpinning the crisis is the crucial political change that was brought about by the opening, and the realising of the significance, of the space for electoral participation. This space was occupied rapidly by the rural poor, the electoral masses, who utilised it to answer their aspirations in accessing the state's resources (Walker, forthcoming).

However, in the Thai case, the outcomes that were brought about the opening of such space were not consistent with the vision of the common good held by those with communitarian vision, which focuses on the communitarian virtues of self-reliance and autonomy. The moral unit they tried to promote, perhaps disappointingly to them, differed from ones that arose from allowing the masses to have their voices. A crucial dilemma may have arisen in this situation whether to allow the weak and the poor, whom the populist tries to protect, to make their own choice or not. The reaction to this dilemma among the communitarians, in the case of Thailand, illustrates so well that how the vision of community can have the primacy over the meaning of democratic participation. Essential to what happened in the Thai case was a reconstructing the notion of participation around the vision of community that downplayed the significance of this dilemma. This is illustrated through the case study how participation

can be effectively re-visioned to serve the ideal of community, with the crucial nature of the notion community facilitating this subversion.

It is shown through the case of the Communitarian Democracy movement that the discourse of community can help construct an alternative version of democratic participation. Participation was co-opted as an attribute of the imagined community, and it was subject as means to serve the communitarian virtues. The exploration of the construction of Communitarian Democracy shows how the symbolic construction of community was applied to construct the alternative vision of participation within the boundary of us/them, moral/immoral. Democratic participation was divided and identified. As a result, a type participation that is visioned to be consistent with the CCD is identified as moral and belongs to us. And the electoral system is identified as immoral and alien. Also playing a crucial role in this re-visioning of democratic participation was the assimilation of perspectives such as direct democracy to serve the process of subversion. The concept of direct democracy that was assimilated is, however, selective. It argued for the surpassing of representatives as better, but the direction of this surpassing is not heading toward letting everyone having their direct says. Direct democracy, in this case, is rather a direct way for the communitarians to have their say and achieve their goals.

There is, however, another side that is worth mentioning of this re-visioning of democratic participation along the vision of community. There is a crucial price to be paid to the subversion of participation to serve the vision of community. Having the vision of "community" determining the "common good" as the purpose of participation also put to sideways the possibility of having participation as the space for the individuals' free exercise of choices. This is explained by Bauman as follow;

"The 'really existing community', a collectivity which pretends to be community incarnate, ...demands unconditional loyalty and treats ...The 'really existing community', were we to find ourselves in its group, would demand stern obedience in exchange for the services it renders or promises to render." (Bauman, 2001:4).

The vision of community itself also works to conceal this price of freedom. Through the vision of community, it is assumed that there has always been the togetherness, common

identity and interests. In such imagined communities, there is not supposed to be much difference within a collective unit anyway. Individual's freedom, therefore, can fall as the smaller and perhaps not so significant part of the collective freedom. Yet, in the world that is not as simple as the imagined communities, the collective freedom itself can turn out to be a prison for some members of the community. As a particular group defines collective freedom and pursues their own vision, others are subjected to it. The sacrifice to be made, in this case, may not be everyone's freedom, but the freedom of those who do not possess or belong to that vision. The willingness of the CCD proponent to neglect the value of the choices by those who do not possess the same vision as them signify this danger of the reinventing democracy through the communitarian vision. The case of Communitarian Democracy in Thailand reminds us how communitarianism can turn the space of participation into the authoritarian's device, where the value of freedom and individual rights are crowded out by the vision of common good set by some who believe they possess a more valuable cause than others.

Conclusion

This paper uncovers the effects that the notion of community can have over the vision of democratic participation when the two concepts are combined together. The tension that is not easily recognisable between the vision of community and the freedom of individuals is highlighted through the case of the Communitarian Democracy movement in Thailand. It is shown through the case study that the assimilation between the concept of community and democracy can be highly problematic, as the communitarian vision can subvert democratic participation into the space that its existence is expected to serve the fulfilment of communitarian virtues. More importantly, this subversion comes at a cost of neglecting the freedom of people who do not hold or belong to the vision. Yet, it is highly unlikely that the notion of community will ever disappear, as the notion is instrumental to natural strive for social identity that everyone possesses. This paper does not suggest the total abandonment of the concept; it suggests that the influence of the communitarian vision should be counter-balanced by the recognition of the primary value of freedom and the equality of individuals' rights. Only by doing so would prevent communitarianism from turning into the authoritarian's device.

References

Anan Ganjanapan. 2001. 'Sangkom thai tam kwam kid lae kwam faifan nai ngan kong archan Chattip Natsupha' (The Thai society according to the ideas and aspirations of Chattip Natsupha). in *60 year of Chattip Natsupha*. Bangkok: The Political Economy Center

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001. *Community: Seeking safety in an insecure world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bowie, Katherine A. 1992. 'Unraveling the myth of the subsistence economy: textile production in nineteenth-century northern Thailand'. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 51(4):797-823.

Chatchawal Thongdeelert. 2006. 'Karn muang mai, karn muang samannachan, srang san kwam kem kang tong tin' (The new politics, harmony politics, and the strengthening of the local). in *Ton tang prachattippatai chumchon* (The Beginning of Communitarian Democracy). Bangkok: CSM

Chatthip Nartsupha. 1999. *The Thai village economy in the past*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.

CODI. 2007a. 'Kabuan ongkorn chomchon tua prated yum rattabarn tong sanab sanun hai tra por ror bor sapa ongkorn chumchon tongtin' (Community organisations from all over the country wanted the government to support the promulgation of the Council of Community Organisation Act). *CODI website*. (uploaded date: 24 April 2007) available from http://www.codi.or.th/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=721%3A2010-09-06-04-13-22&catid=42%3A2009-09-22-05-47-57&Itemid=65&lang=th

CODI. 2007b. 'Kanagamakarn klunklong hengchob rang por ror bor sapa ongkorn chumchon' (Preliminary committee approved the draft of the Council of Community Organisation Act). *CODI website*. (uploaded date; 10 July 2008) available from http://www.codi.or.th/webcodi/sapa/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=100&Itemid=2

Cohen, Anthony.P. 1985. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Tavistock. College for Social Management. 2006. *Ton tang prachattippatai chumchon*. Bangkok: CSM

Hewison, Kevin. 2000. 'Resisting Globalization: A Study of Localism in Thailand'. *The Pacific Review*, 13, 2. pp. 279-96

Hewison, Kevin. 2010. "Thailand's conservative democratization," in Y-W. Chu and S-L. Wong (eds.), *East Asia's New Democracies. Deepening, Reversal, Non-Liberal Alternatives*, London: Routledge. pp. 122-40.

Kemp, Jeremy. 1991. 'The dialectics of village and state in modern Thailand'. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 22 (2):312-326.

Nelson, Mecheal. 2007. 'People's Sector Politics' (Kanmueang Phak Prachachon) in Thailand, Hong Kong: City University Hong Kong Southeast Asian Research Centre, Working Paper Series No. 87

Olivier De Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 2005. *Anthropology and development: understanding contemporary social change*. London: Zed Books

Paiboon Wattanasiritham. 2006. 'Karn muang samannachan: Hon tang su karn kae khai kwam kud' Yang (Harmony politics: the pathway toward reconciliation). in *Ton tang prachattippatai chumchon* (The Beginning of Communitarian Democracy). Bangkok: CSM

Pensri Siirob. 2007. 'Jubta por ror bor sapa onkorn chumchon, jubta pak prachachon' (Watch the Council of Community Organisation Act, watch Kanmueang Phak Prachachon). *Matichon Daily* Newspaper. 27 May 2007. Year 30 No. 10669

Prachatai. 2007a. 'Paiboon saner tud pormor jak por ror bor sapa onkorn chumchon plodlok tong tin rawang yaeng umnat' (Paiboon offered to cut the Ministry of Social Development from the Council of Community Organisation Act to solve conflict). *Prachatai Website* (uploaded date: 24 August 2007) available from <http://prachatai.com/journal/2007/08/13948>

Prachathai. 2007b. 'Believe it or not: Noon prachattippatai tang trong rattapraharn ja maimee eak to pai' (Believe it or not: Supporting direct democracy will end the Coup d'état). *Prachatai Website* (uploaded date: 14 June 2007) available from <http://prachatai.com/journal/2007/06/13078>

Prawas Wasi. 2006. 'Karn muang samannachan: srang san kwam kem kang tong tin' (Harmony politics: Strengthening the local). in *Ton tang prachattippatai chumchon* (The Beginning of Communitarian Democracy). Bangkok: CSM

Rigg, Jonathan, and Sakunee Nattapoolwat. 2001. 'Embracing the global in Thailand: activism and pragmatism in an era of deagrarianization'. *World Development* 29 (6):945-960.

Son Roobsoong. 2007. 'Sampart pised Son Roobsoong: Karn luaktung maichai kumtob' (Exclusive interview with Son Roobsoong: Election is not the answer). *Komchadluek Website*. (uploaded date: 8 June 2007)
http://www.komchadluek.net/2007/06/09/q010_122036.php?news_id=122036

Walker, Andrew. 2008. 'The Rural Constitution and the Everyday Politics of Elections in Northern Thailand'. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Vol. 38, No. 1, February 2008, pp. 84 – 105

Walker, Andrew. Forthcoming. Political Peasants: Exploring power in rural Thailand. unpublished

Yukti Mukdawichit. 2005. *An wathanatham chumchon: wathasin lae kanmuang khong chatphan niphon naeo watthanatham chumchon*/ Bangkok: Fa Diawkan.

