

DEMOCRATIC THEORY AND RE-INVENTING DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY: TWO CASES OF GOTONG ROYONG DEMOCRACY IN INDONESIA AND DHARMA'S DEMOCRACY IN TAIWAN

Hari Zamharir¹, Sahrudin Lubis¹

¹Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Nasional, Indonesia

Email: hari_zamharir@yahoo.com

Abstract

From a long way experiment of “imported” democracy in such countries as Indonesia, Turkey, and contemporary Taiwan, there have emerged new ways of making democracy work: Turkey with what is known as negotiated democracy, in Indonesia it is Gotong Royong democracy, and in newly developed system in Taiwan it is Dharma’s democracy. The very point is how to make democracy work. After a long period of political history, new nations that adopt and/or adapt modern democratic values and institutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America find it hard to create a working democracy in their respective countries. This is so given the false idea of modernizing and more over the failure of globalization that impose domination of global corporatism in which economic interests go hand in hand with importing “distorted” democracy. Such a situation has been made worse by the main stream of universalists’ approach to political development that assumes that modern western democracies would work when transplanted elsewhere including Asia, Africa and Latin America. Now that culturalists of political theories develop a competing approach to political development, i.e. culture context theories of political development, we find more promising understanding of new democracies. Dharma’s democracy—whose features are significantly different from the ones from developed nations in the West. Meanwhile in Indonesia, there have been as well “other” consensual democracy basing itself on collective spirit and deliberation—for which I would call it Gotong Royong democracy that has been mandated in the state ideology of Pancasila. In view of finding working democracy, it is demanded that these two cases of “Asian” model of democracy be studied. These two cases would gain support by new state of the arts in democratic theories, i.e. theory of deliberative democracy whose explanatory power justifies the need for deepening democracy.

Keywords: working democracy, culture-context, Gotong Royong democracy, Dharma’s democracy, Indonesia, Taiwan.

INTRODUCTION

Making an account of “non-liberal” democracies would not be theoretically justified unless a sound point of departure is made. From epistemological level, it is the Orientalist’s view that claims that only Western culture can produce true democracy. To political theorists like Zakaria (in Chang & Chu, 2002, 7), the political culture across East Asian nations is but illiberal democracy. This region of the third world will emerge an essentially authoritarian illiberal political cultural—not western liberal democracy. There would not be any democracy or, as Fukuyama (1995) puts it—referring to notable a Southeast Asian leader, Lee Kuan Yew—the Asian alternative is soft authoritarianism. “Lee has argued that this model is more appropriate to East Asia’s Confucian cultural traditions than the Western democratic model. (Liberal) democracy would not be fertile when implanted at the soil of

soft authoritarian like in Taiwan & South Korea—even though the two countries are “less corrupt and more effective in delivering national security social stability and economic prosperity” (Shin & Chu, 2004, 64).

The above point suggests a challenge: How can a working democracy be developed in the framework of both culture-context and competing theories of democracy? It is interesting to make an account of *Gotong Royong* democracy in Indonesia and Dharma’s democracy in contemporary Taiwan

Amidst the failures of the path to democratization is many party of the world, the two cases are worth discussing given the cultural setting that is located in Asia, with two distinct culture—one is predominantly Malay in Indonesia and the other one is Chinese culture. In the meantime, several practices of deliberative democracy in some society in the U.S, England, reveal promising result in terms of “deepening” democracy this account has political thought as the focus as by realizing the fact that in power politics, the idea of consensus mechanism is problematic given the voting-centric being more practical and easily operated. It is our assumption that consensual democracy within theoretical perspective of deliberative democracy would contribute significant to democratization and peacefully transforming the society and government into democratic governance.

It is our propositions that there are almost not any democracies that are termed or are judged as illiberal; claiming that the only true democracy is liberal democracy and that the rest being illiberal is scientifically not justified. The paper shall deal with Dharma’s democracy in contemporary Taiwan and *Gotong Royong* democracy in Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several works on theory and practices of deliberative democracy (TDD) have among others been done by Dong-Sheng and Deng (2007), especially focusing on Taiwan’s consensus conference democracy, Fung and Wright (in Cohen & Joel, 2013) on deepening democracy that includes revitalizing participatory democracy by significant role of the emergence of associations, Aur (2014) who observes the role of religion-based political deliberation using J. Habermas’s perspective, and Shih Ding (2008) who is critical of the theory of the rational nature of deliberative democracy on account of the fact that empirically in Taiwan and China Mainland in Internet chatting both rationality and emotion go hand in hand.

The critical issue of making a democracy work has invited concerns over the role of culture in a given society or political system. The concerns over culture-context theory has led to some sort of school of thought that may be grouped into culturalists—as opposed universalists like that of Zakaria (1997, 22-43) who, in his “The Rise of Illiberal Democracies”, contends that only (liberal) democracy is the true democracy and the rest of the world when having other types of democracy are not the true democracy. Scholars like Lijphart (2004) with his famous Consociation Democracy in Holland context has further focused on the challenge of how to design a sound constitution in order for its democracy work when situated at what has been termed as divided societies, Ian (1979) looks into the problem of stability in a society that is deeply divided—in this case Indonesia is included.

Universalists' approach to studying political development was criticized for instance by Harriger—who noted a significant positive impact of better way to democratize people by his four- year experiment on deliberation at Wake Forest University—noted the acceptance of more diverse in approaches both to methodology and to the “values” question than the top journal conferences and professional organizations neglected. (Harriger, 2010, 1-7). In contrast to universalist's approach trying to make democracy uniform, culturalists's approach accepts more diverse democracies with variation in values, substance and procedures.

With respect to studies on the normative level of democracy in Indonesia, few works have been made: Morfit (1981) who have among the very few scholars identified the state ideology of Pancasila mandated as deliberative democracy; Saputra was of the same account as Morfit, in his article “An interpretation of the Fourth Principle of Pancasila Led by the Wisdom of Deliberation among Representatives: ‘Toward Global Ethic’ *Creative-Innovative Works for A New Paradigm of Human Sciences*” (Saputra, 2014, 749-754).

METHOD

The study employs qualitative research method, with varied views are collected for subsequent process of identifying data by categories and concepts. From these steps, building empirical generalization is then made, taking into account democratic theories. Library research will be the most things to do. Views and opinions of dharma's democracy in contemporary Taiwan are gathered mostly from on-line journals—with the starting point of Richard Madsen's book, *Religious Transformation and Democratization in Taiwan*. The same method applies on Gotong Royong Democracy

It is expected that the outcome of the study could hopefully be of some value to our understanding about “other” democracies . In academic field, it could contribute to improving and reviewing theoretical basis (if the term “theory” is proper) – in the nature of democratic politics. Instead of a mere transference of **absolote or** old fashioned or fossilized assumptions and premises in political theories, the study is expected to contribute to revision in more proper assumption and premises about working democracies. In the setting of developing countries, the study could attract any interested academics in scientific endeavors—in the area of political theorizing. For practical purposes, the outcome could suggest any policy issues in modernization of politics: In terms of cultures, Chinese may prefer adopting a few elements of western political ideas and institutions; politics in India may exercise their “secular” political system. In Indonesia, “westernization” of politics may be avoided. In short, modernization of politics should take into account the society's preferences to political culture, ideas and institutions including possible blend or synthesis. False assumption that religion is an obstacle to development is no longer valid—this is especially true of the reviewed and reinterpreted doctrines of a given religion.

RESULTS

Gotong Royong Democracy of Indonesia

The term Gotong Royong in our articles is not inclined to Soekarno's ideological orientation; but rather to generic meaning of mutual help that prevails across the sub-cultures in diverse ethnic groups and to the notion of deliberation and consensus in the light of Theory of Deliberative Democracy.

In the early days of pre-independence of Indonesia, **Gotong Royong democracy** or deliberation or consensual democracy was practiced with great success, with involvement of what the theory of deliberative democracy calls larger segments of the society. Almost no voting-centric procedure was used; instead deliberation and negotiation of ideas were cordially done. Beyond the local level of village in which traditional GR was in operation, the sessions held by national level of BPUPKI with its main task to formulate a draft of the constitution in the days entering the country's independence in 1945 were likely to have had its members coming from "larger segments of the Indonesian society (Zamharir & Lubis, 2015). In the civil society level, two tides of educational movements took place—one was the movements by religious organization, especially Islam, i.e. Muhammadiyah and Nahdhatul Ulama (NU); and the other one was political-based, notably Taman Siswa Movement led by Ki Hadjar Dewantara, and Kayu Tanam movement in Sumatera (Nishimura, 1995, 22-26). Especially in Kayu Tanam movement, Nishimura observes that out of 29 principles of Kayu Tanam education, the five principles are the same as the five principles of Pancasila—except that, as Nishimura did not specify, the principle "democracy" was not worded in full concepts of the present-day fourth principle. (p. (Nishimura, 1995, 25).

The 1945 Constitution or UUD 1945 firmly embraces the fundamental of people's sovereignty or *volksouvereiniteit*. This is stated in Pasal 1, ayat 2. In the 1945 Constitution or Undang Undang Dasar of the Republic of Indonesia, this fundamental is mentioned both in the preamble and body of the constitution. In the Preamble of Pancasila, it is formulated as follows: "Kerakyatan Yang Dipimpin oleh Hikmah Kebijaksanaan dalam Permusyawaratan/Perwakilan", or people's sovereignty democracy that is guided by wisdom of deliberation either through direct democracy or representative democracy.

An abrupt change in system of government from presidential one to parliamentary took place when the Dutch aggression, starting in 1846 (or only one year after this democratic country lived) occurred in 1946—forcing Indonesia in 1949 to come to an agreement on KMB or Konferensi Meja Bundar in Den Haag, the Netherlands, and accept federal system and parliamentary system of government under the Interim Constitution of 1950 UUDS. Inherited from the Dutch, the parliamentary system of government along with "anomaly" of politics in revolutionary setting seemed to have brought a bitter practice afterwards. **With the adoption of some type of liberal democracy—Feith named it Constitutional Democracy—**during 1955-1959 there emerged a continuing sense of **misunderstanding of the very idea of consensual, deliberative nature of democracy** as mandated in Indonesia's state ideology of Pancasila. Harsh political conflicts during the

parliamentary system of government was stopped as President Soekarno succeeded in proclaiming to turn back the 1945 Constitution in July 5, 1959—with this turning point, the country adopts unitary system of the state or NKRI and presidential system of government, with Soekarno and Mohammad Hatta being the president and the vice president of the Republic of Indonesia.

It is in the era of Soekarno that **some sort of soft authoritarianism (though popularly termed as Guided Democracy)** was implemented—with downgrade of Gotong Royong democracy when limited coalition under the NASAKOM regime was established with the claim that those outside NASAKOM was against the Revolution; also with culminating step of the Parliament's enacting the decision on declaring Soekarno as the president all his life. GD in the eye of a foreign scholar is described as follows: *“the four constant features of GD in the 1959-1962 period (since after 1962, these features did not occur) which will be broadly outlined: (1) heated rivalry of Soekarno-army-Communist as the central focus of the struggle for power, (2) the concept of NASAKOM (the trinity of nationalist, religions and communist streams of political life in Indonesia) as Soekarno's main organizing principle of political representation and manipulation, (3) the prominence of indoctrination and the official ideology, and (4) the propensity toward highly inflationary budgets and serious economic decline”*. (Mackie, 1963, 79). It was written in history that there was a bad practice of manipulation of the idea of people's sovereignty: several segments of the society representing as members of the Parliament (MPs) were chosen by the president for his own political interests. It is observed that Soekarno's Guided Democracy (GD) failed to implement GR democracy.

It was then a great opportunity for Suharto, who was in power beginning 1967, to turn to GR democracy. Starting with political promise to implement Pancasila (include GR democracy) in its original intent and with consistency, Suharto launched Demokrasi Pancasila. With his grip of power, including the introduction of P4 (formal guide to understanding Pancasila and its subsequent implementation), Suharto became very powerful supported by his hegemonic party, Golkar, and the military. Politics in Suharto's hands were no longer democratic politics in essence. Though it was a good path to reduce political parties to only three in number, Suharto's path was not a democracy: only his party, the ruling party of Golkar, being in power, while the other two are outside the government and were never invited by Suharto to form a coalition government. In short, Demokrasi Pancasila, again, **failed to implement GR democracy**. As the history has noted, Suharto was then forced by social movements to step down from office in May 1998.

Given the uncertainty in achieving the level of consolidated democracy in post-Soeharto's era of 1990s, Gaffar—one of the prominent political scientists in Indonesia—coined and **recommended the idea of Uncommon Democracy** for contemporary Indonesia in order to make democracy work. In the sub-topic “Mencari Format Demokrasi Indonesia (in search of the format of Indonesia's democracy), Gaffar contends that given the emergency of political anarchy, a democracy for Indonesia should be something uncommon: there is a need to emerge one dominant party (basing his idea on Sartori's term, i.e. out

distances all other), that is capable of collecting 60 % seats in the parliament, and will be in power for relatively long decades. He further noted that As has also been practiced in Japan's LDP, this one dominant party in power would create "strong government" :Gaffar describes the dominant strong government with the description of respect of human rights, rule of law, etc. –several qualities that Gaffar claims different from those in authoritarian system. Gaffer also bases his idea on social facts of such plurality of ethnic groups, political factors that hinder the possibility of making "normal democracy" work. In terms of forming the government by coalition among parties, Gaffar's conception of Uncommon Democracy seems to exclude this coalition from the agenda given the possibility of black mailing practices (Gaffar, 1999).

Gaffar's road to democracy is accordingly a longer way as the transition discussed within "normal democracy". This one dominant party for Indonesia's setting is called for to fill the gap between **the past political distrust** in the regime (especially during 32 years of Suharto in power) when every thing was done by mobilization by the government and **the current political distrust** on the part of the society that generates potentials of anarchy. General election is also recommended, free & fair election, through with limited room for political contestation. In addition, demand for the fertile growth of sense of tolerance is emphasized by Gaffar but this demand seems to be very far beyond the possibility to emerge in such cultural and political setting in political history of Indonesia.

With current political reform beginning in 1998, the road to democracy has been under way and several advances in democratic politics have been made but, again, many have expressed their complaints about overliberalization of the road, leading it to **the failure of understanding and implementing GotongRoyong democracy**. Therefore, several segments have proposed **the urgent turn to Demokrasi Permusyawaratan or GotongRoyong democracy** as has been mandated in the 1945 Constitution—the democratic ideal that has also been implemented by a few state actors as well amongst the communities.

Dharma's Democracy of Taiwan

Briefly described the success of long march of Chiang Kai Sek from the mainland China was then followed by his rule of the island of Taiwan. As the history went by with long history of authoritarianism in Taiwan, it was in 1987 that the Martial Law was uplifted along with the economic miracle. Welfare created by capitalist model of industrialization—Taiwanese expected more political freedom and one way to actualize such sense of freedom in the mushrooming of religions. In current social science it is the emergence of civil society. Weller's thesis of significant rule of the mushrooming of voluntary association making up active civil society in Taiwan seems to be added with another factor contributing to Dharma's democracy in Taiwan. This has been stressed by Huang (2000) from the University of Montreal, Canada, who observes that while Buddhist communities by at large were passivists in politics, two big groups of them have been exercising Taiwan democracy, i.e. Foguangsan and Tzu Chi Groups "Foguangsan and the Buddhist Compassion Relief Tzu Chi Foundation have developed over the years into large institutions that run their own

hospitals and clinics, universities, publishing houses, and television channels. With a membership of more than one million people for Foguangshan and over two million for Ciji, in a Buddhist population of 4.9 million, both organizations have the capacity to act as pressure groups, if not to perform the role of critics”.

Among the success of Taiwan in conflict resolution has been the way the political elite settle the conflict. Sani & Hara, quoting Van Dijk (1993), write, “elites are those who are in the position to control and manage the extent of discourse and communication” (Sani & Hara, 2007, 9), that Van Dijk call this discourse access : “The wider the range of discourse genres, modes of communication and audience, the more social power and ability, which the elites have, in exercising control over groups and instructions”. (Sani & Hara, 2007, 9). In elite settlement approach, it is noted by Lay and Savirani (2000), that to design a working democracy, a new constitution was agreed upon with the initiative of President Lee Teng Hui to negotiate for national reconciliation. The goodwill of the president is resembled in setting forth an “uncommon mechanism” by holding a meeting of political elites who were in conflict beyond the normal mechanism—the president was NOT using the parliament in this effort. The first meeting in 1990 was called NAC (National Affairs Conference). As noted by Lay dan Savirani,

“sebuah studi sampai pada kesimpulan bahwa NAC merupakan proses awal elite settlements di Taiwan, yang mengambil bentuk separuh matang dan momen NDC yang melengkapi proses ini. Kedua momen ekstra constitutional ini yang kemudian membawa Taiwan menjadi salah satu Negara demokrasi di dunia setelah politik dijinakkan oleh proses negosiasi elit. (“A study has come to conclude that NAC becomes the first stage of elite settlements in Taiwan with half-done output, for further completion of the output in the next session of NDC. Both extra-parliamentary mechanism then brought about democratic country of Taiwan after politics is made softened through the processes of elite negotiation”) (Lay & Savirani, 2000).

There have emerged—as Madsen observed –religious groups transforming into democratic politics. The social mobility as by-product of Taiwan’s success in industrialization has made more people gain higher status: the following are varieties of social strata that the religious groups have:

Chart 01: Religious Groups and Their dominant Stratum of Social Class

Enacting Heaven Temple (Dao Sect)	Lower-middle class
Guangsan	Business people, Public officers, politicians
Tzu Chi Buddhism	Managers & Profesionals
Foguang Buddhism	Educated people

Jones (2008) when reviewing Madsen's book notes that based on the two concepts that Madsen borrowed from Mary Douglas, 'group' and 'grip', "the strong 'group' aspect gives members of these associations reason to care about one another; the relatively weak 'grid' makes their ethical standards more flexible and less authoritarian, and so not likely to give rise to 'crusader mentality' (Jones, 2008, 36), and thus they compare favorably with the more absolutizing moralities of western mo notheism..." (Jones, 2008, 42). Comparing the core of values between Confucian China and American Culture, Chang (2011) finds distinctive features of the two cultures. Both cultures have potential in being in harmony with Liberal Democracy: the two values, "maintain a moderate worldview that disavows extremism; each espouses an order ground on civic virtues (CIVILITY) intended to militate against religious radicalism ". Though the two seemingly possess the same features, the two adopt contrast approach: Confucianism adopts democracy with "passive inducement" whereas the Christian West adopts a "proactive approach of overt conversion ".

In addition the role of the leaders of the four organizations is played under the following strategy: the innovators, "work within these realities, using the symbolism of family to tie their members together (Tzu Chi more than the others), but suggesting only guidelines for members' religious practices and behaviors." (Jones, 2008, 42). As with the philosophy of governing, Chang (2012) observes that there are two important concepts embraced in Confucianism and Taoism—governing by virtue and the high value of merit system: these two concepts

"may be related to people's ideological orientation about political institution. Is to govern by virtue. When a political leader's behavior follows moral doctrines, his or her personal virtue can spread positive influences throughout the country and the leader can achieve more of the collective interests by doing less and allowing everything to function smoothly. On the other hand (on the other side?—HZ), Confucian tradition also stresses meritocracy whereby virtuous plebeian who cultivates his qualities can be a 'Junzi' (gentleman) such that personal efforts can break through the barriers of social class the hierarchic structure in the society" (Chang, 2012, 560-1).

DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSION

From the description of two types of non-western democracies above, it can be noted that the following aspects are involved: (1) the political history setting, (2) the culture, (3) the spectrum of governance system, (4) Elites' roles ; and (5) intervention function of industrialization and education. Of the five the distinctive features above, point (4) elite's role, and point (5) seem to be very crucial points. As has been described earlier, it was in Taiwan where elite's role had significant part to be played, moving toward negotiating format of consensual democracy. Such a role hardly has been played by Indonesia's political elites. Deliberation in Indonesia—and also in Malaysia—is in practice; yet as Sani & Hara observed, in Indonesia deliberative democracy is currently not clear given the political

liberalization in contemporary Indonesia. In contrast BPUPKI's best practice of consensual democracy in 1945—thus before the GR democracy was legally stipulated in fourth principle in Pancasila—the current trend has been worsened. Therefore it is demanded that re-invention of GR democracy be done. In consonance with the need for advancement of social science in Indonesia, similar call is also expressed by former President BJ Habibie in his speech on Pancasila in Jakarta on the occasion of commemorating Independence Day of the Republic Indonesia, June 1, 1945-2011. Habibie said “...dalam forum yang terhormat ini, saya mengajak kepada seluruh lapisan masyarakat khususnya para tokoh dan cendekiawan di kampus-kampus serta di lembaga-lembaga kajian lain untuk secara serius merumuskan implementasi nilai-nilai Pancasila ...yang juga tidak kalah penting adalah peran para penyelenggara Negara dan pemerintahan untuk secara cerdas dan konsekwen serta konsisten menjabarkan implementasi nilai-nilai Pancasila tersebut dalam beberapa kebijakan.....”. In educational field, not only do critics express their views, but also scholar like Nishimura whose account was mentioned in the previous paragraph had a critical view. Nishimura in “Pancasila-ization of national education” noted there had been too flexible way of interpreting Pancasila—during Soekarno's regime the interpretation was inclined to Socialism; when Suharto was in power, “by emphasizing economic development, the aim of education was changed to foster a ‘development-oriented person’ or *manusia pembangunan* who can contribute to the promotion of national development plan”(Nishimura, 1995, 22-26). As with the economic and industrialization aspects, Taiwan's Dharma's democracy has been flourishing partly by the back-up economic miracle; in Indonesia, GR democracy has not obtained favorable atmosphere in economic field.

In the meantime, the deterioration of GR democracy in Indonesia may have been caused by little influence from religion-based civil society: it is true that in terms of high politics big organizations mainly NU and Muhammadiyah have been influential in the national politics, but few efforts were done in terms of cultivating civic virtue coming from Islam. This is regrettable given the NU's firm determination to promote moderate, tolerant Islam. An example of Islamic value is the best practice of elite deliberation called *ahl al-hall wa al-aqd*; this “deliberative democracy” or consensual democracy has not been cultivated up to the present-day civil society of NU and Muhammadiyah.

To conclude, civil society in contemporary Taiwan has been made stronger with significant contribution of religious virtue of such religions as Confucianism and Taoism. In her historical setting, Taiwan had been successful in its path toward industrialization—and such achievement is likely to promote the success of peaceful democratization. In Indonesia, little significant contribution was made by religious organization given the Indonesia's inclination to Islamo-phobia politics in the past. Since deliberative democracy has been mandated in the state ideology of Pancasila—while the country's consecutive regimes were not successful in promoting GR democracy—it is called for to re-invent it; it is now the responsibility of such big religious organizations like NU and Muhammadiyah to take initiative to forge the country with inclusion of religious virtue within GD democracy. There has been ample room to do so because civil society organizations exist and there have been

best practices of GR democracy, though fragmented, by a few institutions like Constitutional Courts or Mahkamah Konstitusi and East Java regional government with Soekarwo's introduction of Demokrasi Permusyawaratan, in which Soekarwo has been critical of voting-centric tendency of current democracy—the tendency that is identified as the causes of deterioration of musyawarah or deliberative democracy; he further urges to re-invent the *demokrasi permusyawaratan* or deliberative democracy. (Soekarwo, 2014).

With strong determination among Taiwanese civil society (among others coming from religious groups) to embrace peaceful mode of consensus-type democracy, Dharma's democracy in that country proves to make steady progress. Dharma's democracy of Taiwan has more promising growth as one of "other" types of democracy and this format of democracy is in line with deliberative democracy as theorized in TDD. In the meantime, Indonesia's GR Democracy has experienced an unfriendly atmosphere in terms of political history and immature political culture within multi-party system, with little support coming from political scientists. Since GR democracy is mandated in the 1945 Constitution, re-inventing it becomes a must. There is an ample room to re-invent GR democracy provided that there is significant contribution of advances in social science in the country, determination among leaders across political groups and sufficient re-education of the society. One lesson learned from the significant inclusion of Confucian and Tao and other religious virtues in the development of Taiwan's consensual democracy, it is high time that GR democracy of Indonesia incorporated religious virtue of major religions in the country.

Both Dharma's democracy and GR Democracy represent the axioms of culturalist's approach to political development study and provide proofs that other modes of democracy are scientifically justified, denying the axioms of the sole type of what is the-so called liberal democracy.

Acknowledgement

The writers express our great gratitude especially to the government of the Republic of Indonesia (Directorate General of Higher Education, the Ministry of Research & Technology, and Higher Education) for providing its 2nd year grant of the research fund, *Hibah Bersaing* 2016. The original topic of the proposed research is "Demokrasi Gotong Royong Dalam Sila Keempat Pancasila Dan Implementasinya Dalam Kerangka Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial Pasca Amandemen UUD 1945".

REFERENCE

- Chang. Wen-Chun. 2012. "Eastern Religions and Attitude toward Direct Democracy in Taiwan", *Politics and Religion*, No 5 (3), (Religion and Politics Section of the APSA), Cambridge University Press, pp. 555-583
- Effendi, Nursyirwan. 2014. "Budaya Politik Khas Minangkabau sebagai Alternatif Budaya Politik di Indonesia". *Jurnal Masyarakat Indonesia*. Vol 40 (1), June 2014, pp. 75-88.
- F. Fukuyama. 1995. "Confucianism and Democracy" *Journal of Democracy*. 6.2. 20-23

- Gaffar, Afan. 1999. *Politik Indonesia :Transisi Menuju Demokrasi*. Jogya :Pustaka Pelajar
- Harriger, Katy J. 2010 “Political Science and the Work of Democracy” *Journal of Public Deliberation*. Vol 6 (1) pp 1-7.
<http://jati.um.edu.my/iconsea2007/download/paper/azizvddinb.pdf>
- Jones. Charles B. 2008. “Democracy’s Dharma: Religious Renaissance and Political Development in Taiwan By Richard Madsen” (“Book Review”), *Journal of Global Buddhism*, No 9, pp. 38-44
- Kawamura, Koichi. 2011 “Consensus and Democracy In Indonesia: Musyawarah-mufakat Revisited”, *Institute of Development Economies, JETRO*, (working paper no.308 : paper.ssrn.com.), pp. 1-12
- Lay, A Savirani. *Reformasi Konstitusi Dalam Transisi Menuju Demokrasi*
- Lay, Cornelis & , A Savirani. 2000. “Reformasi Konstitusi Dalam Transisi Menuju Demokrasi”, *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 2000 - jurnalsospol.fisipol.ugm.ac.id
- Morfit, Michael.1981. “Pancasila: The Indonesian State Ideology According to The New Order Government”. *Asian Survey* Vol 21 No. 8 (Aug, 1981), pp. 838-851
- Nishimura. Shiegeo. 1995. “The Development of Pancasila Moral Education in Indonesia”, *Southeast Asian Studies*. Volume 33 (3), Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, pp. 21-34
- Sani, Mohammad Azizuddin & Abu Bakar Eby Hara.. 2007. “Deliberative Democracy in Malaysia and Indonesia :A comparison”, pp. 1-21
- Saputra (2014). “An interpretation of the Fourth Principle of Pancasila Led by the Wisdom of Deliberation among Representatives: ‘Toward Global Ethic’ *Creative-Innovative Works for A New Paradigm of Human Sciences*” (Proceeding. International Conference Thoughts on Human Sciences in Islam), Jakarta, 19-20 November 2014, pp.. 749-754.
- Schafferer, Christian. 2010, “Consolidation of democracy and historical legacy: a case study of Taiwan”, *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, Vol 9 (1), pp. 23-41
- Shin, Doh Chull& Yun Han Chu. 2004 “The Quality of Democracy in South Korea and Taiwan : subjective assessment from to perspective of ordinary citizens”, *a paper*, pp. 1-64
- Soekarwo. 2014. “Menggagas Politik dan Masa Depan Pembangunan Nasional Pasca Pilpres 2014”. *Presidential Lecture*, Sekolah Pascasarjana UNAS, 17 Januari
- Yu-tzung Chang & Yun-han Chu 2002.”Confucianism and democracy : empirical study of mainland china, Taiwan, and Hongkong”. *Working paper Asian Barometer Project Office, National*. Taiwan University Academica Cinica, pp. 1-32
- Zamharir, Hari & Sahrudin Lubis. 2015 “Political Reform in Contemporary Indonesia: Why Has ‘GotongRoyong’ Democracy of Indonesia’s State Ideology of Pancasila Failed to Be Understood and Implemented?”, *Paper Proceeding*, International Conference on Social Science and Humanities (ICSSH 2015),IASTEM; Kuta, Bali, Indonesia, 17 October.