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Abstract

The democratic transition is one of the most decisive phases for the sustainability of democracy in every country. The success of a country in managing its democratic transition after the fall of military regime has significant impact on the effort to establish constitutional liberal democratic country, where civil supremacy over military established, civil liberties guaranteed, role of civil society increased and check and balances mechanism growth. Indonesia and Turkey are two countries that emerged as key player in their region and could become models for democratic transition in their own region respectively. Holding the predicate as majority Muslim country with secular character gives them privilege to claim the status as model for democracy in the Muslim World and in the Middle East as whole. In the post Arab Spring where some countries attempt to find model for their transition, the experience of both countries are considerable. This paper discusses the experiences of Indonesia and Turkey in managing democratic transition and the direction of democracy in both countries.
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Indonesia and Turkey: Representing Muslim Democrats?

Indonesia and Turkey have similarities on the issue of democratic transition because the process of democratization in both countries was a result of struggle of political actors and civil societies at the domestic level to end military domination which ruled the two countries for decades. International factor played significant role during the process of democratic transition in both countries because the international organization such as the International Monetary Fund and the European Union always require democratization and institutional reform as a precondition for every member state before accessing financial assistance.
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Indonesia and Turkey have been known as two secular countries\(^2\) but majority of their populations are Muslim and have very strong experience in the field of implementation of democracy compared to some other predominantly Muslim populated countries that still face the problems of authoritarian regime and monarchies.\(^3\)

After decades of democratic transition, characterized by the political liberalization, establishment of foundation of democracy through free and fair elections, increasing awareness on the issue of human rights as an effort to reach a level of consolidated democracy, in its development, the two countries have different directions. Indonesia, according to the report entitles “democracy index 2015” released by The Economist Intelligence Unit, placed in the category of "Flawed Democracy" with 7.04 score out of 10 because of its ability to reach number of standards including electoral process and pluralism, civil liberties, the functioning of government, political participation and political culture. While Turkey on the other hand in the category of "Hybrid Regime" with basic assumption that the regime in Turkey is able to reach those standards with 5.12 score out of 10.\(^4\)

However, both countries recently enjoying their status as emerging market, marked by their membership in the elite group of G-20, an economic group which combining world largest, advanced and emerging economy which controls 85 percent of the Gross World Product (GWP) and 80 percent of world trade.\(^5\) In addition, a new term introduced by Jim O’Neill puts Indonesia and Turkey as part of next new economic giants called MINT (Mexico, Indonesia, Nigeria and Turkey)\(^6\), the group that he predicts will have capability to challenge the group of Brasil, Russia, India and China or BRICs.

---


\(^5\)“G20 Members” for detail information could trace in https://www.g20.org/about_g20/g20_members, accessed in 10 November 2014.

Overall, the new face of Indonesia and Turkey today as a result of their process of transition from military dictatorship toward the process of finding stability of its democracy, and the absence of military intervention implies to the stability within the domestic level and ease them to accelerate development process and enable them to expand their influence in international politics through multilateral diplomacies.\(^7\)

The aim of this research is to investigate the pattern of democratic transition after a decade of transition, whether both countries reached level of consolidated democracy or entrapped into “political gray zone”.

**Indonesian and Turkish’s Experience on Managing Democratic Transition**

When look back to Indonesian’s experience on democratic transition it will bring us to the momentum of “Reformasi”\(^8\) in 1998 which precipitated by the 1997 economic crises that hit Southeast Asia countries. The *Reformasi* was a term used by Indonesian middle class to end military dictatorship during Suharto’s regime who ruled the nation for more than 30 years. The years after reformation were the hardest part of transition for the state, because the political realities within the state was very complex and diversified in terms of languages, races, cultures, political ideologies and religions.\(^9\)

Pro reformation activists have serious concern related to the situation during transitional period because the existence of Suharto’s loyalists especially “hardliners”\(^10\) within state structure ranging from judiciary, military and bureaucracy institutions still have ability to regain power from transitional government. If these groups could create horizontal conflict at the domestic

---


\(^8\) “Reformasi” means reform, the term has been used by Indonesian to challenge status quo, the idea of reform expressed by Indonesian middle class including civil society activists and student movements to end the era of Suharto, at the same time used as a momentum to eradicate corruption, collusion and nepotism.

\(^9\) During this period the political complexity after the fall of Suharto would affected to separation of the nation into small countries as happened in former Yugoslavia. But at the end, the transitional government under President Habibie succeed in managing transition through organization of first general elections freely and fairly.

\(^10\) The term “hard liners” used to explain the existence of groups within the body of authoritarian regime, its refer to groups that fully support authoritarian regime and resist the possibility of regime change in radical manners while the opposite of this group is “soft liners” who also part of authoritarian regime but allow possibility of change within regime, for detail explanation on this concept could see in Guillermo O’donnell and Philippe Schmitter, ed. *Transition from Authoritarian Rule, Tentative Conclusion about Uncertain Democracies* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp. 15-16.
level by using ethnic issues to provoke the masses, it would bring Indonesia into different version of Balkanization. The issue of identity is very sensitive in Indonesian politics either during Suharto’s period or after the fall of his regime. But, when the transitional government succeed in organizing general election in 1999 which involving 48 political parties, the signs of optimism re-emerge in Indonesia. Since that day Indonesian try to increase the quality of their democracy.\(^{11}\)

The period of transition often described as “an interval between one political regime to another”\(^{12}\). Referring to this concept we can say that Indonesia and Turkey are on its process to reach other level of democracy either constitutional liberal democracy or electoral democracy or illiberal democracy.\(^{13}\) In the last decade, Indonesia emerge with new image and more confident in offering their model of democratic transition to their neighbors in Asia Pacific regions and the world at large. The Indonesian government holds an annual event called Bali Democracy Forum (BDF) in order to discuss the development of democracy in various countries, as a place where the ideas of democracy discussed and exchanged.\(^{14}\) This event was an effort to send message to the world that the face of new Indonesia\(^{15}\) is more democratic compared to 30 years ago and calling the states which are still facing problem of democratic transition to learn from Indonesian model.\(^{16}\) Even though the issues of corruption which involving political actors and political oligarchy still become main obstacles for Indonesian development on democracy issue.\(^{17}\)

Turkey also has similar story with Indonesia in terms of the influence of economic crisis to the political instability, compare to Indonesia, Turkey has faced frequent political breakdowns in time of economic crisis\(^{18}\), including the economic crisis in November 2000 and February 2001


\(^{14}\) See Bali Democracy Forum official site especially in Agenda part in [http://bdf.kemlu.go.id](http://bdf.kemlu.go.id).

\(^{15}\) Related to development of Indonesian democracy and institutional reform could see Ross H. McLeod and Andrew Macintyre, eds. *Indonesia: Democracy and the Promise of Good Governance*, (Singapore: ISEAS Publishing, 2007), pp. 6-11.


where Turkey faced difficult situation and demanding international financial assistance\textsuperscript{19} to recover their economy. Political climate during this period was still fragile because political parties were unable to form stable coalition inter-party and at the same time the shadow of military intervention always emerge in time of crisis.\textsuperscript{20}

Compared to Indonesia which still deals with the issue of restoring democratic system after the collapse of Suharto’s regime who only allowed three parties to compete in every general election and placed Golkar party with special status and privilege, Turkey during this period has already established strong political infrastructure that allow every political party to compete in a free and fair manner. As shown in 2002 general election where political parties compete to attract voters with various issues but the main issue during this moment was how to revamp national economy after a wave of economic crisis and possibility of Turkish membership in European Union.

Political preferences within the voters during this period was a reflection on how political parties react to economic situation and offer solution to the problem regardless of their ideological background. In 2002 general election AKP (Adalet Kalkınma Partisi or Justice and Development Party), a new established party with Islamist background, won landslide victory. The victory of the AKP in 2002 for some scholars seen as the repetition of the era of 1950s and 1980s denoted by the victory of Democrat Party and Motherland Party by maximizing economic issue and attempted to challenge the status quo in Turkish politic.\textsuperscript{21}

The victory of the AKP in general election also brought them to rule the nation with single government after the nation witnessed last single government during Turgut Ozal’s period in 1980s.\textsuperscript{22} When the party established the new government, then they started to implement policies which prepared to accelerate the process of reform to adjust with the standard of the international organizations. At the domestic level the ruling party attempted to fulfill the

precondition from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for financial assistance and the European Union (EU) for the Turkish full membership.\textsuperscript{23}

**Democratic Narrative in post-Arab Spring**

The experience of Indonesia and Turkey in managing democratic transition are two interesting topic for the study of contemporary democracy because previous researches tend to focus their research on the issue of democratic transition\textsuperscript{24} after the end of Cold War.

Democratic narrative in the last decade becomes main attention of scholars and world leaders because of the increasing number of democratic countries and political turbulence in several countries after the wave of revolution which ousting authoritarian regimes in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{25} Compare to 1974 when the “Third Wave” term of democracy introduced for the first time by Samuel Huntington after the fall of authoritarian regimes in Portugal, Spain then followed by the other countries in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America,\textsuperscript{26} recent trend shows number of electoral democracies increased three times reached 110 countries.\textsuperscript{27} The increasing number of electoral democracies and expanding of democratic value across the globe inseparable from the impact of globalization process where the interaction among nations brought them to exchange ideas directly and share various values, in this case democratic value. The contestation between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War also must be considered as one of significant factor behind the spreading of democracy.

In order to understand basic concept of democratic transition toward consolidation we can refer the view of Guillermo O’Donnell who explain the characteristic of transition of democracy toward consolidated democracy in two conditions: First, the transition from dictator regime towards democracy by installing democratic instrument. Second, the period of consolidated democracy where every political actor considered democracy as “the only game in

town\textsuperscript{28} and there is no possibility of reverse. Basic argument of this theory leads the researcher to investigate the pattern of democratic transition in Indonesia and Turkey, whether both countries completed their democratic transition and move towards consolidation or stuck in an incomplete transition.

The developments of democracy in Indonesia and Turkey, marked by the decreasing influence of military in political arena, the phenomena of establishment of political parties by numbers of military pensioners in Indonesia as well as in Turkey, the amendment of laws related to martial law, transparency on security sectors. On the issue of reform in security sector Indonesia amended the concept of dual function of military or “Dwi Fungsi ABRI” in 2004, while in Turkey since 2003 the ruling party proposed the amendment of law for the security sector especially for the revision of law which manage the civil-military relation in National Security Council (MGK).

Ted Piccone, a senior researcher in the Brookings Institution, in his book “Five Rising Democracies”\textsuperscript{29}, put Indonesia and Turkey together with other three countries including India, Brazil and South Africa as group who have ability to maximize democratic stability at domestic level and accelerate their economic development.\textsuperscript{30} According to Piccone, these countries share same experiences on how these states rebuild after decades of military domination who played supreme role, how the mentality of their leaders after long period colonialism, the impact of apartheid policy and state authoritarianism. In its development these countries could manage democratic transition and became more open to global market and participated in resolving world economic problems through their membership in international financial regime such as World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF).\textsuperscript{31} The author appreciate the success of the five countries and explained reasons behind their achievements:


\textsuperscript{31} Ted Piccone, ‘Five Rising Democracies’, p. 5.
“...1. They leaped from closed, authoritarian, illiberal governance to more open, representative, and accountable political and economic systems; 2. They made impressive progress in delivering better standards of living for their citizens, and their success as aspiring democratic powers could potentially impact other societies striving for change; 3. Their remarkably diverse populations, evident in multiple languages, ethnicities, and religions, distinguish them from more homogeneous and relatively cohesive societies such as Poland, South Korea, and Chile.”

Piccone also highlight the case of Indonesia and Turkey, he argued that the reasons behind Indonesian success in managing their democracy which enable them to improve their economic performance and wrote history of economic surplus in the highest rate after decade of democratic transition between 2004 to 2014 during Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono era, in this period number of middle class increased, political accountability improved, law enforcement strengthened. These facts in some issues make Indonesia become a model of how development and democracy interlinked.

While for the case of Turkey, according to Piccone, this country succeed in managing its economy and democracy after establishment of single government in 2002, and became first single government since 1987. During this period AKP appear as new regime that could tackle economic problem in Turkey between 2002-13 when Turkish economy grew significantly till 253 percent, which implied to increasing number of million middle class. However, the success in economic sector made the ruling party faced syndrome of over-confidence because of their ability to dominate parliament and President Recep Tayyip Erdogan’s approach toward freedom of media questioned. The domination of the ruling party in Turkey leads to the decline of checks and balances.

The recent developments in both counties also explained that democratic transition does not automatically lead certain country become a consolidated democracy because the direction of democratic transition really depends on the ruling regimes and political culture within each country.

**The Future of Democracy in Indonesia and Turkey**

---

32 Ted Piccone, ‘Five Rising Democracies’, p. 4
As mentioned in the previous part, that observing characteristic of democratic consolidation in Muslim countries will add new information for scholars who focus their study on democratization all over the world. Generally political scientists in this subject focused their studies on Latin America as the object of their research. Showing the experience of the both countries will beneficial for several countries in the Middle East, Latin America, Africa and other regions that still face democratic transition.  

Indonesia and Turkey still deal with the issue of democratic transition and attempt to reach consolidated democracy. There are several standards that must be fulfilled including agreement on political procedure, legitimacy of elected official and independence of courts. Linz and Stephan mentioned that requirement as: “sufficient agreement has been reached about political procedures to produce an elected government, when a government comes to power that is the direct result of a free and popular vote, when this government de facto has the authority to generate new policies, and when the executive, legislative and judicial power generated by the new democracy does not have to share power with other bodies de jure”.  

Both countries gained different category on the issue of quality of democracy, Economist Intelligence Unit put Indonesia in the category of “Flawed Democracy” while Turkey as “Hybrid Regime”. Even tough, the assessment from Freedom House Index and Economist Intelligence Unit are not main basis of conclusion of this research, the researcher utilizes their approaches in investigating Indonesian and Turkish’s development of democracy.  

From the perspective of minimalist democracy or electoral democracy, Indonesia and Turkey have been experienced the tradition of democracy since the early establishment of the two countries. Indonesia after its independence from the Dutch have implemented a democratic system that guarantee the suffrage of whole citizens regardless their race or religions to decide their leaders. While in Turkey who heir Ottoman Empire’s legacies attempted to transform itself from imperium to the new Republic and installing mechanism that allows every citizen to vote and compete in political competition to gain the power.

---

In the last two decades, democracy in both countries do not show possibility of breakdown thanks to several factors that embedded as a requirement to support the process of consolidation such as: (1) Behaviourally, the emergence of awareness within political actors that make democracy as the only rule of the game to gain power as many scholars called as "the only game in town". Nowadays Indonesia and Turkey have more stable democracy due to the supporting system within the state. In the security sector, both countries have resilience military force in each region that make no space for foreign power to intervene or taking over from the legitimate governments. At the same time political actors in domestic level avoided non-democratic and non-violent ways to gain power. Every political actors maximizing the existence of democratic instrument either political parties or civil societies to channel their aspirations.

(2) Attitudinally, majority of Indonesian citizens want democracy as a system that enable them to channel their aspirations and trusted the existence of democracy as an instrument that could change their fate. The same situation also happens in Turkey where democratic mechanism became an instrument to exercise the willingness of people for the changing of regimes. Through this mechanism every candidate can compete in general elections regardless their political background. Number of political participation in both countries from one election to other election increases significantly. In Indonesia, during general election in 2014 number of political participation was 74 percent while in Turkey number of political participation in the latest general election of 2015 was 85 percent. This statistic showed how the citizens in both countries exercise their duty to decide the fate of the nation trough democratic mechanism.

(3) Constitutionally, the role of constitution and constitutional court became more decisive for recent years. Every party or political actors involved in the political process and respect the legal procedure. The existence of principle of equality before the law could guarantee the establishment of order. The existence of law supremacy within the society could prevent any kind of oppression by the state, prevent abuse of power by the ruling regime.

Both countries have legal institutions which have been transformed into more impartial institution who could guarantee the justice for every party. One of the principles that embedded with constitutional court is the authority to annul every government policy that contrary to the constitution. Through constitutional court every party could challenge the policy of the government.
In Indonesian case, in 2013 number of non-governmental organizations or civil societies filed a lawsuit to the court to stop the government's policy on liberalization of energy sector. At the same year Muhammadiyah as a representative of civil society through its lawyers call the government to allocate 20 percent of their budget for education. Muhammadiyah argued that the government ignore mandate of the Indonesian constitution which place education sector as main priority since the independence of the country. At the end, the Constitutional Court accepted the judicial review from non-governmental organizations and called on the president to allocate minimum 20 percent of their budget for education.

The Constitutional Court played significant role in resolving the political dispute either at the local and national level. In 2014 presidential election the court made decisive verdict in order to solve the dispute between two groups who compete in presidential race. One party rejected the result of election by showing several evidences, while the other party from Indonesian General Election insisted the result of presidential election was undeniable through their evidences. After hearing the arguments from both parties and the process inside the court broadcasted by television, then the judges finally decided to reject the request from the party that reject the result of election. When the verdict was read every party respect the result.

While in the Turkish context, Constitutional Court also plays important role in dealing with the case that involving state and its citizen as well as the reaction toward constitutional articles that against the right of its citizen. The court acted as a party that examines each case filed by whole parties. One of the cases is the lawsuit by the Association of Architect in Turkey called Turkiye Mimarlar ve Muhendisler Odasi Baskanligi (TMMOB) with its branch in Ankara, Ankara Mimarlar Odasi, Peyzaj Mimarlar Odasi, Cevre Muhendisleri Odasi, Sehir Planclari Odasi and Ziraat Muhendisleri Odasi. In 2014 the architect association filed a lawsuit to the court related to the construction of the new palace in Ankara, they argued that the construction violate environmental law standards. In this case the court accepted the file but the result was rejection for the case.

Based on the experience in Indonesia and Turkey we can see how political actors give full credence to the legal institutions to resolve their conflict with legal considerations that make

38 Erdinç Çelikkan “Chamber of engineers and architects to be brought under ministry, draft bill says”, Hurriyet Daily News, 10 December 2014.
status of the government and the people are equal. The implementation of principle of justice in the courts is one of the most important indicators to examine the success of a country in managing democratic transition toward consolidated democracy.

The emergence of AKP also followed by the creation of new narrative within the state that this party is a representation of “New Turkey” that will bring Turkey towards 2023 vision and demonizing the era of CHP “republican era” as the regime of the past. However, during this period there are concern within Turkish middle class relate to the domination of AKP’s regime with the lack of opposition will bring Turkey become an authoritarian country. This perception emerges after witnessing several cases related to the policy who made by the government passed easily in the parliament because of the domination of the party. The other fact related to development of Turkish politics is strict polarization within Turkish society between Islamist and secularist due to inability of ruling party to create pluralist policy after dominating the power. This situation also reminded us to the era of Margaret Thatcher in England where the regime rules the nation for three decades without strong opposition.

The issue of military reform also showed significant progress in both countries. In Indonesia, the agenda of reform demanding basic reform in the military institution. The supremacy of military for decade during Suharto’s regime placed the military as supreme institution who can install their cadres in every institution. Their involvement in political arena was the most problematic during that period.

According to the Huntington’s theory of civil-military relation that the ideal position of military in democratic system is the existence of objective civilian control over military institution.39 In this concept the military institution must be controlled by civil institution and make military as an institution which focus on the issue of defense and security. When the military reach highest level of its professionalism and concern with the issue of defense and security then the possibility to involve in political arena will be decreased.

The Indonesian government started to reform military institution since the period of Abdurrahman Wahid’s period and continue in the era of Megawati Sukarnoputri and Susilo

Bambang Yudhoyono. Since 2002 the House of Representative passed the law on the position of military as an instrument of the state. This law also governing the separation between the Indonesian Armed Forces with Indonesian Police. Since this period the conception of deal function of military abolished and would be implemented in 2009, however this decision implemented earlier because of the support from The Indonesian Armed Forces headquarter who decided to leave political stage earlier.

In order to show civil supremacy over military, Abdurrahman Wahid introduced new tradition to appoint minister of defense from civilian figure. Wahid appointed the figure of Matori Abdul Djalil as his minister of defense from his party and this tradition continued in the next reshuffle when he appointed Mahfud MD to fill the post.40 Even tough, the government forced military to act professional under the control of elected government, but the military still attempted to show their influence by showing their force toward Wahid’s presidency. This behavior changed since the era of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono where military institution openly declared their commitment to respect democracy and elected government.

While in Turkey, the attempt to control military reflected in the implementation of democratic standard based on the European Union’s guidelines.41 The AKP regime proposes several laws to decrease the influence of military in political arena. This policy reflected in the amendment of Law related to counter terrorism law, revision on the composition of National Security Council (MGK). According to the new law the Minister of Defense have an authority to give an order to Chief of General of Land Forces, Naval Forces, Air Forces, or Gendarmerie.

The AKP also gained momentum to reform the military institution when the diary of former commander of navy exposed in weekly magazine in March 2007, in this diary explained the coup plan against the AKP’s government in 2003-2004. Since June 2007 the Turkish prosecutor arrested more than 300 people including military officers, journalist, and academics. Those who arrested either from military or civilian accused of being involved with the movement called “Ergenekon” who tried to create chaos and planning coup against the AKP’s

government. This event became legitimation for the ruling party to foster the process of military reform in Turkey based on the standard of the EU. The accusation to the involvement of the military personnel who planning coup against the AKP’s government affected to the decrease of trust of the Turkish public toward military institution (TSK) as a supreme institution in Turkey.

Political stability in Indonesia and Turkey in the past two decades followed by significant economic growth had a positive impact on the government's image and increasing public trust towards the democracy in the two countries. The existence of civil society organizations such as Wolfgang Merkel proposed in his concept of good democracy (embedded democracy) to play a role as a counterbalance to state power also seen in Indonesia and Turkey. While the judiciary in the two countries, especially the Constitutional Court, play significant role in giving space for the public to ensure that the state does not suppress the rights of the people.

In some point, Indonesia and Turkey has been able to meet the minimum requirements to achieve the consolidation of democracy or liberal democracy but still need a long effort to build a democratic culture, either at the elite and public level. Democratic culture that grows naturally in the community itself will help to maintain the stability of democracy in both countries. The existence of democratic culture in both countries also will reduce fraud attempt to gain voters in Indonesia as well was reducing political polarization in Turkey.

**Conclusion**

The researcher argues that democratic transition is an interval period between one types of democracy to another. In some countries both domestic and international actors play significant

---


role in deciding the direction of democratic transition. The finding of the research indicates that Indonesia and Turkey shows the directions of democratic transition towards democratic consolidation in both countries are in grey zone. However, still better compared to some countries in Middle East after Arab Spring or Latin America after decades of revolution movement, in Turkey and Indonesia general elections are organized freely and fairly. There is room for civil society groups to monitor process of elections. The public in both countries is allowed access to parliamentary debates through media both print and electronic on wide range of policy issues.

In addition, the military intervention in both countries decreased significantly due to the ability of government in both countries to manage domestic developmental problems and enjoying rapid growth particularly. This enabled incumbent groups to gain popularity among voters insisted by the increase in the votes of incumbent compare to previous elections. On negative side, the increase in incumbent popularity generates majoritarian dictatorship, whereby the vision and opinion of opposition as either ignored or viewed as a destruction.

For example, voters in Indonesia can side material solicitation in deciding the direction of their votes. The consequence by this has monetization of the electoral process of the country. It is therefore not surprising to find political leaders imprisoned over corruption scandals. In Turkey, however voters based their choices on ideological leaning as against material inducement. This showed the strong of ideological attachment in Turkish politics.

From the foregone, it can be argued that the preservation of democracy can begin from the organization of regular general elections that respect free and fair principle which characterized the legitimation of ruling government. In the case of Indonesia, the ability of of newly established institutions such as election committee to organize free and fair elections at least increased the level of trust among political actors who compete in general elections. Also, the positioning of constitutional court as the last gate for electoral disputes ensures that political figures and political parties do not use undemocratic means to express their disappointments. Similarly, in Turkey, election committees attempt to make the electoral process free and fair as well open and transparent allowing the participation of non-government organization and the media engagement to cover the electoral process.
Political culture in Indonesia and Turkey also formed the focus of this research because the existence of political parties on one hand contributes to the creation of political awareness. On the other, political parties also serves as a vehicle to promote the political ambition of certain figures who can use them to provide the private and parochial interests.

Finally, the researcher argue that the survival of consolidated democracy depends on the trust among political actors and must be reflected through the implementation of the good governance principles within the state system which provides room for the resolution of political dispute through constitutional means by maximizing the role of independent court. The court should act base on “equality before the law” to prevent the abuse of power by the ruling group and to make sure the freedom of political expression especially against government policies guaranteed.

Again, the environment should allow civil society organizations (CSOs) to play key role by acting as both a check on government and the voice of the citizenry. The researcher places democratic culture as the sine qua non of the survival of the consolidated democracies.
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