

# Quality of Authoritarianism Data Set

## Code Book, Version 1 (March 2020)

**Lee Morgenbesser**

School of Government and International Relations

Griffith University

[l.morgenbesser@griffith.edu.au](mailto:l.morgenbesser@griffith.edu.au)

<http://www.leemorgenbesser.com>

### Citation

Morgenbesser, Lee. *The Rise of Sophisticated Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

### Table Contents

Introduction	1
Sample	2
Sources	3
Identification Variables	4
List of All Indicators - Institutional Configuration	5
- Control System	9
- Information Apparatus	16
- Development Scheme	20
- International Conduct	22
Codebook Bibliography	28
Data Reference List	30

## **Introduction**

This codebook describes the coding procedures for the indicators used to evaluate the quality of authoritarian rule. The Quality of Authoritarianism (QoA) data set is the centerpiece of an accompanying book which addresses the evolution of authoritarian rule in Southeast Asia from 1975 to 2015. This timeframe captures the four decades that followed the start of the “Third Wave of Democratization,” including the Cold War and post-Cold War periods (see Huntington, 1991). The goal is to scrutinize the “quality” of authoritarian rule by making a typological distinction between retrograde and sophisticated regimes. Against this backdrop, the QoA data set offers a systematic account of the established features and new techniques authoritarian regimes in Southeast Asia have utilized.

## **Sample**

The sample of country years is measured using data on the dichotomous coding of autocracy and democracy from the Boix-Miller-Rosato (2013) data set. This sample is 99.3 percent similar to the data set of Geddes et al. (2014). The country years covered include:

Brunei, 1985-2015  
Cambodia, 1975-2015  
Indonesia, 1975-1998  
Laos, 1975-2015  
Malaysia, 1975-2015  
Myanmar, 1975-2015  
Philippines, 1975-1985  
Singapore, 1975-2015  
Vietnam, 1975-2015

## Sources

The QoA data set is a beneficiary of the recent renaissance in the study of authoritarian politics. To account for the quality of authoritarian rule in Southeast Asia, it extracts information from a variety of data sets within the field of political science (especially Coppedge et al., 2019). The vast majority of this existing information, which is updated where necessary, is included as part of “institutional configuration” and “development scheme” dimensions. In all, 29 indicators are sourced from widely available cross-national time-series data sets within the field of political science. In addition, 14 indicators are sourced from data published by national governments or intergovernmental organizations. Finally, the QoA data set codes 30 original indicators. This information is drawn from country guides, data archives, encyclopedias, government websites, election monitor reports, historical accounts, international organization databases, news reports, political handbooks and records of world events (see the reference list at the end of this codebook). In instances where the question is inapplicable, or data is missing, the response “-9” is entered, unless otherwise noted.

Known Errors: Two coding errors were discovered in the data set after publication of the attached monograph. For QOA\_ELECTYPE, no “0” entries were recorded for all country-years. For QOA\_PUBINS, no “1” entries were recorded for Vietnam. The overall results are not affected by these errors and they will be corrected in the next version of the data set.

### **Identification Variables**

**COW:** Correlates of War country code

**YEAR:** Calendar year

**BMR\_CASENAME:** Consecutive years of the authoritarian regime based on Boix et al. (2013)

**BMR\_COUNTRY:** Lists the full country name in English

## **List of Indicators**

The indicators are clustered and partitioned according to five dimensions: institutional configuration, control system, information apparatus, development scheme and international conduct. See the preferred citation for the rationale behind these dimensions.

Due to the style policy of Cambridge University Press, shorter indicator names were required for Tables 2-6 of the monograph. To help readers navigate the resulting differences, the relevant *monograph entry* is stated for each indicator.

### **Institutional Configuration**

#### **1. QOA\_CON**

*Question:* What type of constitution exists?

*Monograph Entry:* “Constitution type” in Table 2.

*Source:* Recoded from Law and Versteeg (2013)

*Responses:*

- 1: Strong
- .66: Modest (sham)
- .33: Weak
- 0: No constitution

#### **2. QOA\_EXESEL**

*Question:* What was the mode of selection for chief executive?

*Monograph Entry:* “Selection mode” in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Cheibub et al. (2010: exselec)

*Responses:*

- 1: Direct election (election of the chief executive by popular vote or the election of committed delegates for the purpose of executive selection).
- .50: Indirect election (selection of the chief executive by an elected assembly or by an elected but uncommitted electoral college).
- 0: Non-elective (any means of executive selection not involving a direct or indirect mandate from an electorate).

#### **3. QOA\_EXETERM**

*Question:* Does the chief executive rule absent term limits?

*Monograph Entry:* “Term limits” in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Przeworski (2013: preterm\_limit)

*Responses:*

- 1: if no term is specified
- .80: unlimited number of consecutive terms
- .60: out after more than one term, can come back
- .40: out after more than one term, can never come back
- .20: out after 1 term, can come back
- 0: out after 1 term, can never come back

#### **4. QOA\_EXETERMCHA**

*Question:* If the government executive changed the term limits, what mechanism was used?

*Monograph Entry:* “Term limits change” in Table 2.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

- 1: Plebiscite or referendum
- .66: Legislative vote
- .33: Judicial ruling
- 0: Executive decree
- 9: No change

## **5. QOA\_EXESUC**

*Question:* Were succession rules in place for the selection of the chief executive?

*Monograph Entry:* "Succession rules" in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Frantz and Stein (2016)

*Responses:*

- 1: Designational (chief executives are chosen from within the political elite without formal competition); or regulated (chief executives are determined through hereditary succession or competitive elections).
- 0: Unregulated (no procedures exist for transferring power between chief executives).

## **6. QOA\_RULCOA**

*Question:* Did the chief executive come from the same ruling coalition as their predecessor?

*Monograph Entry:* "Succession outcome" in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Svobik (2012: pol\_aff)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes (new leader has explicitly stated a pro-government position prior to assuming office)
- .5: Unaffiliated (new leader has not unambiguously stated his support or opposition to the government prior to assuming office)
- 0: No (new leader has explicitly stated an anti-government position prior to assuming office)
- 9: The country was newly independent or under occupation.

*Clarification:* A ruling coalition consists of an uninterrupted succession in office of politically affiliated authoritarian leaders.

## **7. QOA\_ELECTYPE**

*Question:* Was a national election held?

*Monograph Entry:* "Sanctioned" in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2elmulpar\_ord)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No
- 9: Not Applicable (non-election year)

## **8. QOA\_EMB**

*Question:* Did the Election Management Body (EMB) have autonomy from the government to apply election laws and administrative rules impartially in national elections?

*Monograph Entry:* "Administration" in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2elembaut\_ord)

*Responses:*

1: Ambiguous. The EMB has some autonomy but is also partial, and it is unclear to what extent this influences the outcome of the election.

.66: Somewhat. The EMB has some autonomy on some issues but on critical issues that influence the outcome of elections, the EMB is partial to the de facto ruling body.

.66: Almost. The EMB has autonomy and acts impartially almost all the time. It may be influenced by the de facto ruling body in some minor ways that do not influence the outcome of elections.

.33: No. The EMB is controlled by the incumbent government, the military, or other de facto ruling body.

0: Yes. The EMB is autonomous and impartially applies elections laws and administrative rules.

-9: No elections

*Clarification:* The EMB refers to whatever body (or bodies) is charged with administering national elections.

## **9. QOA\_ELECTIME**

*Question:* What were the conditions under which national elections were scheduled?

*Monograph Entry:* "Scheduling" in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Wig et al. (2015: electtime)

*Responses:*

1: At the will and timing of the executive (no formal schedule).

.50: Formal mechanisms for scheduling within a fixed interval, but the timing was determined by extant political processes (inexact periods).

0: Formally scheduled elections at fixed intervals (exact periods).

-9: Not applicable (no election)

## **10. QOA\_FPELEC**

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_SYSPARTY), did any government-created or government-aligned parties compete in the national election?

*Monograph Entry:* "Systemic parties" in Table 2 (under Elections).

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not Applicable (no election; no government-created or government-aligned parties)

*Clarification:* See QOA\_SYSPARTY

*Note:* If the election involves multiple rounds, both rounds are coded.

## **11. QOA\_LEGSEL**

*Question:* What was the mode of selection for legislative members?

*Monograph Entry:* "Selection mode" in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Cheibub et al. (2010: legselec)

*Responses:*

1: Elective (legislators, or members of the lower house in a bicameral system, are selected by means of either direct or indirect popular election).



- .50: Non-elective legislature (examples include the selection of legislators by the effective executive, or on the basis of heredity or ascription).
- 0: No legislature exists (includes cases in which there is a constituent assembly without ordinary legislative powers).

Note: In 2011, Myanmar's legislature became a combination of "elective" (75 percent of members) and "non-elective" (25 percent of members). To capture this exception, it was coded as .75.

## **12. QOA\_LEGPART**

*Question:* Did political parties exist in the legislature?

*Monograph Entry:* "Pluralism" in Table 2.

*Source:* Replication of Cheibub et al. (2010: lparty)

*Responses:*

- 1: Legislature with multiple parties.
- .50: Legislature with only members from the regime party.
- 0: Either no legislature or all members of the legislature are nonpartisan.

## **13. QOA\_SYSPARTY**

*Question:* Did government-created or government-aligned political parties exist (beyond the incumbent party) within the legislature?

*Monograph Entry:* "Systemic parties" in Table 2 (under Legislature and parties).

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2psoppaut\_ord)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No

*Clarification:* Government-created or government-aligned parties are defined as those lacking autonomy and independence (even as official opposition parties).

*Note:* This measure captures the degree of party autonomy within a political system. In particular, the existing Varieties of Democracy responses of (1) are coded as "yes" (1) and the responses of (0), (2), (3) and (4) are coded as "no" (0).

## **14. QOA\_COPFOR**

*Question:* Did a government-created cooperative forum permanently exist at the national level?

*Monograph Entry:* "Cooperative forum" in Table 2.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No

*Clarification:* In contrast to QOA\_ADVCON, a cooperative forum focuses on including business, labor and other special interest groups.

## **15. QOA\_ADVCON**

*Question:* Did a government-created advisory congress (i.e., a systemic legislature) permanently exist at the national level?

*Monograph Entry:* "Advisory congress" in Table 2.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No

*Clarification:* In contrast to QOA\_COPFOR, an advisory congress focuses on including citizens. It is a non-elected institution that exists in addition to the “real” legislature.

*Note:* A partially appointed systemic legislature is coded as 1.

### **Control System**

#### **16. QOA\_TERROR**

*Question:* What was the overall state of repression?

*Monograph Entry:* “Political terror scale” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Wood and Gibney (2010: Amnesty; State Dept)

*Responses:*

- 1: Countries under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their views, and torture is rare or exceptional. Political murders are extremely rare.
- .75: There is a limited amount of imprisonment for non-violent political activity. However, few persons are affected, torture and beatings are exceptional. Political murder is rare.
- .50: There is extensive political imprisonment, or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without a trial, for political views is accepted.
- .25: Civil and political rights violations have expanded to large numbers of the population. Murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. In spite of its generality, on this level terror affects those who interest themselves in politics or ideas.
- 0: Terror has expanded to the whole population. The leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals.

*Note:* The original Amnesty and United States State Department scores on repression have been inverted and the mean between them calculated. For coding purposes, the range has been rescaled to between 0 (“Terror has expanded to the whole population”) and 1 (“Countries under a secure rule of law”).

#### **17. QOA\_HIGHREP**

*Question:* What was the state of high intensity coercion?

*Monograph Entry:* “Coercion intensity” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Cingranelli et al. (2014: physint)

*Responses:* The CIRI Human Rights Data Project uses an additive index constructed from the Torture, Extrajudicial Killing, Political Imprisonment and Disappearance indicators. It ranges from 0 (no government respect for these four rights) to 8 (full government respect for these four rights).

*Note:* For coding purposes, the range has been rescaled to between 0 and 1. This variable is used as a proxy measurement for high-intensity coercion.

## **18. QOA\_LOWREP**

*Question:* What was the state of low intensity coercion?

*Monograph Entry:* “Coercion intensity” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Cingranelli et al. (2014: new\_empinx)

*Responses:* The CIRI Human Rights Data Project uses an additive index constructed from the foreign movement, domestic movement, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and association, workers’ rights, electoral self-determination and freedom of religion indicators. It ranges from 0 (no government respect for these seven rights) to 14 (full government respect for these seven rights).

*Note:* For coding purposes, the range has been rescaled to between 0 and 1. This variable is used as a proxy measurement for low-intensity coercion.

## **19. QOA\_DEFECT**

*Question:* Did any members of the ruling coalition or incumbent party defect to join an existing opposition party or create a new party?

*Monograph Entry:* “Defected from regime” in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: No

0: Yes

-9: No opposition parties are legally allowed to exist

*Note:* An individual who leaves the ruling coalition and/or incumbent party, but retains a cabinet position, is not coded as defecting.

## **20. QOA\_KILLED**

*Question:* Were any opposition leaders killed?

*Monograph Entry:* “Killed” in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: No

0: Yes

-9: No opposition parties (and thus leaders) are legally allowed to exist

*Clarification:* An opposition leader is a former head of state or an individual who heads - either on a de jure and de facto basis - any of the three most popular political parties not in the governing coalition.

## **21. QOA\_OPPPRI**

*Question:* Were any opposition leaders presumed missing, under house arrest or confined to prison?

*Monograph Entry:* “Arrested/imprisoned” in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: No

0: Yes

-9: No opposition parties (and thus leaders) are legally allowed to exist

*Clarification:* See QOA\_KILLED for the definition of opposition leader.

## **22. QOA\_OPPEXIT**

*Question:* Were any opposition leaders prevented or banned from leaving the country?

*Monograph Entry:* “Travel ban” in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: No

0: Yes

-9: No opposition parties (and thus leaders) are legally allowed to exist

*Clarification:* See QOA\_KILLED for the definition of opposition leader.

*Note:* If the opposition leader is imprisoned, they are “not banned” from leaving the country.

## **23. QOA\_OPPLAW**

*Question:* Did a member of the government file or continue to pursue a legal suit (e.g., defamation or libel) against an opposition leader?

*Monograph Entry:* “Defamation/libel suit” in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: No opposition parties (and thus leaders) are legally allowed to exist

*Clarification:* See QOA\_KILLED for the definition of opposition leader.

## **24. QOA\_OPPREG**

*Question:* Did the government file or continue to pursue a regulatory infraction (e.g., health and safety breach) against an opposition party?

*Monograph Entry:* “Regulatory infraction” in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: No opposition parties (and thus leaders) are legally allowed to exist

*Note:* Alleged infractions to do with the registration of parties are not coded.

## **25. QOA\_OPPCOOP**

*Question:* Were any opposition leaders co-opted into the government, ruling coalition, incumbent party and/or bureaucracy?

*Monograph Entry:* “Co-opted into regime” in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

*Clarification:* See QOA\_KILLED for the definition of opposition leader.

*Note:* Opposition leaders who were newly co-opted and were already co-opted are both coded.

## 26. QOA\_ELECBUY

*Question:* Was there evidence of vote and/or turnout buying in the national election?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election manipulation” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2elvotbuy\_ord)

*Responses:*

1: Yes. There was systematic, widespread, and almost nationwide vote/turnout buying by almost all parties and candidates.

.75: Yes, some. There were non-systematic but rather common vote-buying efforts, even if only in some parts of the country or by one or a few parties.

.5: Restricted. Money and/or personal gifts were distributed by parties or candidates but these offerings were more about meeting an ‘entry-ticket’ expectation and less about actual vote choice or turnout, even if a smaller number of individuals may also be persuaded.

.25: Almost none. There was limited use of money and personal gifts, or these attempts were limited to a few small areas of the country. In all, they probably affected less than a few percent of voters.

0: None. There was no evidence of vote/turnout buying.

-9: No election

*Clarification:* Vote and turnout buying refers to the distribution of money or gifts to individuals, families, or small groups in order to influence their decision to vote/not vote or whom to vote for. It does not include legislation targeted at specific constituencies, i.e., “porkbarrel” legislation.

*Note:* The Varieties of Democracy variable “v2elvotbuy\_ord” is being used as an inverted proxy for clientelism, which represents a form of co-optation.

## 27. QOA\_ELECINT

*Question:* Was there evidence of voter intimidation in the national election?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election manipulation” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2elintim\_ord)

*Responses:*

1: None. There was no harassment or intimidation of opposition by the government or its agents, during the election campaign period and polling day.

.75: Restrained. There were sporadic instances of violent harassment and intimidation by the government or its agents, in at least one part of the country, and directed at only one or two local branches of opposition groups.

.50: Yes, some. There was periodic, not systematic, but possibly centrally coordinated – harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents.

.25: Yes, frequent: There was systematic, frequent and violent harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents during the election period.

0: Yes. The repression and intimidation by the government or its agents was so strong that the entire period was quiet.

-9: No election

*Clarification:* Other types of clearly distinguishable civil violence, even if politically motivated, during the election period are not factored in when scoring this indicator.

## **28. QOA\_ELECPRO**

*Question:* Were there riots and protests after a national election?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election protest” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Hyde and Marinov (2012: nelda29)

*Responses:*

1: No (or unclear)

0: Yes

-9: Not Applicable (no election that year)

*Note:* This variable has been inverted so that a 1 indicates there were no riots or protests.

## **29. QOA\_PROVIO**

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_ELECPRO), did the government use violence against the demonstrators?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election protest outcome” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Hyde and Marinov (2012: nelda31)

*Responses:*

1: No (or unclear)

0: Yes

-9: Not applicable (no protests)

*Note:* This variable has been inverted so that a 1 indicates no violence.

## **30. QOA\_CS**

*Question:* How robust is civil society?

*Monograph Entry:* “Operational scope” in Table 3.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2xcs\_ccsi)

*Responses:* Continuous ranging from 0 (least robust) to 1 (most robust).

*Clarification:* This variable is designed to provide a measure of a robust civil society, understood as one that enjoys autonomy from the state and in which citizens freely and actively pursue their political and civic goals, however conceived.

## **31. QOA\_ANTI-CS**

*Question:* What level of interference was exercised over civil society groups?

*Monograph Entry:* “Interference level” in Table 3.

*Source:* Collation of the questions listed below, which are individually sourced.

*Responses:* Continuous ranging from 0 (low interference) to 1 (high interference).

*Note:* The responses are coded using the sum of the answers to the questions listed below. The sum ranges from 0 to 12, which has been standardized from 0 to 1.

## **QOA\_REGIS1**

*Question:* Were NGOs required to register with the government?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

## **QOA\_REGIS2**

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_REGIS1), is registration burdensome?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes (Process is characterized by delayed, vague, onerous procedures)

0: No (Process is well-defined and timely)

QOA\_APEAL

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_REGIS1), were NGOs granted a legal right to appeal if denied registration?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_BARRIERS

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_REGIS1), were barriers to entry different for NGOs receiving foreign funds?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes (more burdensome)

0: No (the same or less burdensome)

QOA\_DISCLOSE

*Question:* Were NGOs required to disclose their funding sources to the government?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_GOVAPPR

*Question:* Did NGOs need prior approval from the government to receive foreign funding?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_CHANL

*Question:* Were NGOs required to channel foreign funding through state-owned banks or government ministries?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_FORFND

*Question:* Were all NGOs prohibited from receiving foreign funds?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: No

.5: Partially (up to a certain threshold)

0: Yes

QOA\_FORFND\_CT

*Question:* Was a category of NGOs prohibited from receiving foreign funds?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Partially (up to a certain threshold)

.5: Yes

0: No

QOA\_NGO\_ACT

*Question:* Did the law restrict NGOs from engaging in political activities?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Partially (the government regulates the topics that NGOs may address and/or the ability to publicly express political views).

.5: Yes

0: No

QOA\_NGO\_INT

*Question:* Did the government use intimidation or dissolution to deter NGOs from engaging in political activities?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: No

0: Yes

QOA\_NGO\_RES

*Question:* Were restrictions on political activities different for NGOs receiving foreign funds?

*Source:* Replication of Christensen and Weinstein (2013: 2a-d; 3a-c; 3e-f; 4a-c)

*Responses:*

1: Yes (more restrictive)

0: No (same or less restrictive)

### **32. QOA\_YOUTH**

*Question:* Did the government party maintain a permanent youth group or movement?

*Monograph Entry:* "Youth" in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

*Note:* The source of the youth group or movement, be it the incumbent party, national police or government ministry, is not distinguished. All sources are instead coded as part of the government.

### **33. QOA\_YOUTHARM**

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_YOUTH), was the youth group or movement armed?

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

*Note:* "Armed" includes the most basic of weapons, such as guns, clubs, knives and sticks.

### **34. QOA\_YOUTHELEC**

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_YOUTH), did the government deploy the youth group or movement for a national election?

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)



-9: Not Applicable (no election)

**35. QOA\_VETERAN**

*Question:* Did the government party maintain a permanent veteran's group or movement?

*Monograph Entry:* "Veterans" in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

*Note:* The source of the youth group or movement, be it the incumbent party, national police or government ministry, is not distinguished. All sources are instead coded as part of the government.

**36. QOA\_VETERANARM**

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_VETERAN), was the veteran's group or movement armed?

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

*Note:* "Armed" includes the most basic of weapons, such as guns, clubs, knives and sticks.

**37. QOA\_VETERANELEC**

*Question:* If yes (QOA\_VETERAN), did the government deploy the veteran's group or movement for a national election?

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

-9: Not Applicable (no election)

**38. QOA\_AUXGRO**

*Question:* Did the government provide de-facto support to an auxiliary group capable of administering repression?

*Monograph Entry:* "Auxiliary group" in Table 3.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes (established)

.5: Unclear (rumored)

0: No

*Clarification:* Only groups who have previously committed repression are coded.

*Note:* This variable codes any group operating at any time not already captured by the QOA\_YOUTH and QOA\_VETERANS variables.

**Information Apparatus**

### **39. QOA\_COLINFO1**

*Question:* Did the government maintain a local institution (e.g., a consultative forum, meet the people sessions) that was designed, either implicitly or explicitly, to collect information about the beliefs, grievances and/or preferences of citizens?

*Monograph Entry:* “Local organization” in Table 4.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

*Note:* “Local” refers to the lowest level of state administration in a given country.

### **40. QOA\_COLINFO2**

*Question:* Did the government maintain a research center that was designed, either implicitly or explicitly, to collect electronic data about the beliefs, grievances and/or preferences citizens expressed online?

*Monograph Entry:* “Digital center” in Table 4.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

### **41. QOA\_CEN**

*Question:* Did the government directly or indirectly attempt to censor the print or broadcast media?

*Monograph Entry:* “Media censorship” in Table 4.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2mecenefm\_ord)

*Responses:*

1: Attempts to censor are indirect and limited to especially sensitive issues.

.75: Attempts to censor are indirect but nevertheless routine.

.50: The government rarely attempts to censor major media in any way, and when such exceptional attempts are discovered, the responsible officials are usually punished.

.25: Attempts to censor are direct but limited to especially sensitive issues.

0: Attempts to censor are direct and routine.

-9: No data.

*Clarification:* Indirect forms of censorship might include politically motivated awarding of broadcast frequencies, withdrawal of financial support, influence over printing facilities and distribution networks, selected distribution of advertising, onerous registration requirements, prohibitive tariffs, and bribery. The focus is not censorship of topics such as child pornography, statements offensive to a particular religion, or defamatory speech unless this sort of censorship is used as a pretext for censoring political speech.

### **42. QOA\_INTCEN**

*Question:* Did the government attempt to censor information (text, audio, or visuals) on the Internet?

*Monograph Entry:* “Internet censorship” in Table 4.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2mecenefi\_ord)

*Responses:*

1: The government allows Internet access, including to some sites that are critical of the government, but blocks selected sites that deal with especially politically sensitive issues.

.75: The government successfully blocks Internet access except to sites that are pro-government or devoid of political content.

.50: The government allows Internet access that is unrestricted, with the exceptions mentioned below.

.25: The government attempts to block Internet access except to sites that are pro-government or devoid of political content, but many users are able to circumvent such controls.

0: This country has no Internet access at all.

-9: No data; internet not yet invented.

*Clarification:* Censorship attempts include Internet filtering (blocking access to certain websites or browsers), denial-of-service attacks, and partial or total Internet shutdowns. The focus is not censorship of topics such as child pornography, highly classified information such as military or intelligence secrets, statements offensive to a particular religion, or defamatory speech unless this sort of censorship is used as a pretext for censoring political information or opinions. The focus is also not the extent of internet access, unless there is absolutely no access at all (in which case the coding should be 0).

#### **43. QOA\_TROLL**

*Question:* Is there evidence that the government paid some citizens to provide positive commentary of its activities on websites and/or social media platforms?

*Monograph Entry:* “Propaganda” in Table 4.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

*Clarification:* The existence of troll armies is being used as a narrow proxy for modern propaganda.

#### **44. QOA\_RESPOND**

*Question:* When important policy changes are being considered, to what extent did political elites acknowledge and respect counterarguments?

*Monograph Entry:* “Counterclaims” in Table 4.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2dlcountr\_ord)

*Responses:*

1: Elites almost always acknowledge counterarguments and explicitly value them, even if they ultimately reject them for the most part (i.e., “accepted but later rejected”).

.80: Elites tend to acknowledge counterarguments without making explicit negative or positive statements about them (i.e., “noted but indifferent”).

.60: Elites almost always acknowledge counterarguments and explicitly value them, and frequently also even accept them and change their position (i.e., “noted and reconciled”).

.40: Elites tend to acknowledge counterarguments but then explicitly degrade them by making a negative statement about them or the individuals and groups that propose them (i.e., “allowed and degraded”).

- .20: Counterarguments are allowed at least from some parties, but almost always are ignored (i.e., “allowed and ignored”).
- 0: Counterarguments are not allowed or if articulated, punished (i.e., “prohibited and punished”).

*Clarification:* Since discourse varies greatly from person to person, this measure is based on the style that is most typical of prominent national political leaders.

#### **45. QOA\_ANTICORR**

*Question:* Did the government maintain an anti-corruption unit premised on being independent from the government?

*Monograph Entry:* “Anti-corruption unit” in Table 4.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

- 1: Nominally independent
- .5: Not independent
- 0: Does not exist

#### **46. QOA\_GONGO**

*Question:* Is there evidence the government coordinated the national activities of a non-government organization?

*Monograph Entry:* “GONGOs” in Table 4.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No

*Note:* A government operated non-government organization maintains the outward appearance of independence, but subtly advances government positions (see Dobson, 2012; Walker, 2016).

#### **47. QOA\_PUBINS**

*Question:* Is there evidence the government provided support, either directly or indirectly, to a public policy institute that claims to be independent?

*Monograph Entry:* “Policy institute” in Table 4.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No

#### **48. QOA\_DMON**

*Question:* Were election monitors from all parties and independent domestic election monitors allowed to monitor the vote at polling stations across the country?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election observers” in Table 4.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2eldommon)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No
- 9: Not applicable (no election)

#### **49. QOA\_DMONFAKE**

*Question:* Is there evidence the government deployed a nominally independent domestic observation group during a national election?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election observers” in Table 4.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (no election)

Note: A nominally independent election observation group is a domestic organisation that maintains the outward appearance of independence, but always endorses the integrity of an election. They are modelled on international “shadow” observation groups (see QOA\_IMONFAKE).

### **Development Scheme**

#### **50. QOA\_POLCOR**

*Question:* How pervasive was political corruption?

*Monograph Entry:* “Political” in Table 5.

*Source:* Adapted from Coppedge et al. (2019: e\_v2x\_corr\_4C)

*Responses:*

1: Never

.66: Occasional

.33: Often

0: Constant

*Clarification:* The Varieties of Democracy corruption index includes measures of six distinct types of corruption that cover both different areas and levels of the polity realm, distinguishing between executive, legislative and judicial corruption. Within the executive realm, the measures also distinguish between corruption mostly pertaining to bribery and corruption due to embezzlement. Finally, they differentiate between corruption in the highest echelons of the executive (at the level of the rulers/cabinet) on the one hand, and in the public sector at large on the other. The measures thus tap into several distinguished types of corruption: both ‘petty’ and ‘grand’; both bribery and theft; both corruption aimed and influencing law making and that affecting implementation.

*Note:* This variable has been inverted so that a 1 indicates there was no corruption.

#### **51. QOA\_EXCOR**

*Question:* How routinely did members of the executive, or their agents grant favors in exchange for bribes, kickbacks, or other material inducements, and how often did they steal, embezzle, or misappropriate public funds or other state resources for personal or family use?

*Monograph Entry:* “Executive” in Table 5.

*Source:* Adapted from Coppedge et al. (2019: e\_v2x\_execorr\_4C)

*Responses:*

1: Never

.66: Occasional

.33: Often

0: Constant

*Clarification:* See QOA\_POLCOR

*Note:* This variable has been inverted so that a 1 indicates there was no corruption.

## **52. QOA\_PSCOR**

*Question:* To what extent did public sector employees grant favors in exchange for bribes, kickbacks, or other material inducements, and how often did they steal, embezzle or misappropriate public funds or other state resources for personal or family use?

*Monograph Entry:* “Public-sector” in Table 5.

*Source:* Adapted from Coppedge et al. (2019: e\_v2x\_pubcorr\_4C)

*Responses:*

- 1: Never
- .66: Occasional
- .33: Often
- 0: Constant

*Clarification:* See QOA\_POLCOR

*Note:* This variable has been inverted so that a 1 indicates there was no corruption.

## **53. QOA\_MILEXP**

*Question:* Did military expenditure (as a percentage of gross domestic product) increase?

*Monograph Entry:* “Military expenditure” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No

## **54. QOA\_TAXREV**

*Question:* Did the amount of tax revenue received by the government increase?

*Monograph Entry:* “Tax revenue” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No

## **55. QOA\_FDI**

*Question:* Did the amount of foreign direct investment (net inflows) increase?

*Monograph Entry:* “Direct investment” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No

## **56. QOA\_FORAID**

*Question:* Did the net official developmental assistance received increase?

*Monograph Entry:* “Foreign aid” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No
- 9: Not required due to developed economy status

**57. QOA\_GDPPC**

*Question:* Did the gross domestic product per capita increase?

*Monograph Entry:* “Gross Domestic product” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No

**58. QOA\_INFLATION**

*Question:* Was the rate of inflation two percent or less?

*Monograph Entry:* “Inflation rate  $\leq 2\%$ ” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

*Responses:*

- 1: Yes
- 0: No

**59. QOA\_UNEMPLOY**

*Question:* Did the national rate of unemployment (as a percentage of the total labor force) decrease?

*Monograph Entry:* “Unemployment rate” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No

**60. QOA\_EDU**

*Question:* Did government expenditure on education (as a total percentage of gross domestic product) increase?

*Monograph Entry:* “Education spending” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No

**61. QOA\_HEALTH**

*Question:* Did government expenditure on health (as a total percentage of gross domestic product) increase?

*Monograph Entry:* “Health care spending” in Table 5.

*Source:* World Bank (2019)

- 1: Yes (or remained the same)
- 0: No

**International Conduct**

**62. QOA\_HR**

*Question:* What is the rate of adoption on international human rights agreements?

*Monograph Entry:* “Human rights ratification” in Table 6.

*Source:* Collation of the questions listed below, which are individually sourced.

*Responses:* Continuous ranging from 0 (lowest level of ratification) to 1 (highest level of ratification).

*Note:* The responses are coded using the sum of the answers to the questions listed below. The sum ranges from 0 to 12, which has been standardized from 0 to 1.

QOA\_HR\_GEN

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_HR\_REF

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_HR\_RAC

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_HR\_ECON

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (1966)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_HR\_CIV

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

QOA\_HR\_WOM

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1979)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (did not exist)



QOA\_HR\_TOR

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (did not exist)

QOA\_HR\_CHI

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (did not exist)

QOA\_HR\_IND

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (1989)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (did not exist)

QOA\_HR\_MIG

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (1990)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (did not exist)

QOA\_HR\_DIS

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the Convention on Persons with Disabilities (2006)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (did not exist)

QOA\_HR\_ENF

*Question:* Was the government a ratifying party to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (2006)?

*Source:* United Nations (2018d)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (did not exist)

## 63. QOA\_UNHRC

*Question:* Did the government have membership on the United Nations Human Rights Council and, previously, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights?

*Monograph Entry:* “UNHRC membership” in Table 6.

*Source:* United Nations (2018a)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

#### **64. QOA\_UNSCR**

*Question:* Was the government criticized and/or condemned through a United Nations Security Council resolution?

*Monograph Entry:* “UNSC criticism” in Table 6.

*Source:* United Nations (2018c)

*Responses:*

1: No

0: Yes

#### **65. QOA\_SANCTIONS**

*Question:* Was the government the target of economic sanctions by the United States and/or the United Nations?

*Monograph Entry:* “Economic sanctions” in Table 6.

*Source:* Replication of Hufbauer et al. (2009); Morgan et al. (2014: primarysender)

*Responses:*

1: No

0: Yes

#### **66. QOA\_UNSCV**

*Question:* Was a United Nations Security Council resolution critical of the government vetoed by one of the permanent five members (i.e., China, France, Russia, United Kingdom and the United States)?

*Monograph Entry:* “UNSC veto” in Table 6.

*Source:* United Nations (2018b)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: No resolution

#### **67. QOA\_IMON**

*Question:* Were international election monitors allowed to monitor the vote at polling stations across the country?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election observers” in Table 6.

*Source:* Replication of Coppedge et al. (2019: v2elintmon)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No (or unclear)

-9: Not applicable (no election)

#### **68. QOA\_IMONFAKE**

*Question:* Is there evidence the government deployed a nominally independent international observation group during a national election (i.e., a “shadow” group)?

*Monograph Entry:* “Election observers” in Table 6.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

-9: Not applicable (no election)

Note: A nominally independent international is an intergovernmental organisation or closely related international non-governmental organisation that has a low 'democratic density' of member states (i.e., a majority of autocratic states) and is not a signatory to the *Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and Code of Conduct for International Election Observers* (2005). See Debre and Morgenbesser (2017).

#### **69. QOA\_PARALL**

*Question:* Did the incumbent party maintain an alliance - formalized through an agreement - with the incumbent party of another authoritarian regime?

*Monograph Entry:* “Ruling party alliance” in Table 6.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes (for each confirmed alliance)

0: No

#### **70. QOA\_PRFIRM**

*Question:* Did the government hire – or continue to employ – a public relations firm based in the United States?

*Monograph Entry:* “Public relations firm” in Table 6.

*Source:* United States Department of Justice (2019)

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

#### **71. QOA\_THINK**

*Question:* Is there evidence the government provided any funding to a think tank based in the United States?

*Monograph Entry:* “Think tank” in Table 6.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

#### **72. QOA\_RADIO**

*Question:* Is there evidence the government operated, either directly or indirectly, a radio station?

*Monograph Entry:* “Overseas radio station” in Table 6.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

*Clarification:* The radio station can be based either in the country or overseas

**73. QOA\_TV**

*Question:* Is there evidence the government operated, either directly or indirectly, a television station?

*Monograph Entry:* “Overseas television station” in Table 6.

*Source:* Original coding

*Responses:*

1: Yes

0: No

*Clarification:* The television station can be based either in the country or overseas.

## Codebook Bibliography

- Boix, C., M. Miller and S. Rosato. 2013. 'A Complete Data Set of Political Regimes, 1800–2007.' *Comparative Political Studies* 46 (12): 1523-1554.
- Cheibub, J., J. Gandhi and J. Vreeland. 2010. 'Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited.' *Public Choice* 143 (1): 67-101.
- Christensen, D. and J. Weinstein. 2013. 'Defunding Dissent: Restrictions on Aid to NGOs.' *Journal of Democracy* 24 (2): 77-91.
- Cingranelli, D., D. Richards and K. Clay. 2014. 'The CIRI Human Rights Dataset (Version 2014.04.14).'
- Coppedge, M., J. Gerring, C. Knutsen, S. Lindberg, J. Teorell, D. Altman, M. Bernhard, M. Fish, A. Glynn, A. Hicken, A. Lührmann, K. Marquardt, K. McMann, P. Paxton, D. Pemstein, B. Seim, R. Sigman, S. Skaaning, J. Staton, S. Wilson, A. Cornell, L. Gastaldi, H. Gjerlow, N. Ilchenko, J. Krusell, L. Maxwell, V. Mechkova, J. Medzihorsky, J. Pernes, J. Römer, N. Stepanova, A. Sundström, E. Tzelgov, Y. Wang, T. Wig and D. Ziblatt. 2019. 'V-Dem [Country-Year/Country-Date] Dataset v9.' Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project.
- Debre, M. and L. Morgenbesser. 2017. 'Out of the Shadows: Autocratic Regimes, Election Observation and Legitimation.' *Contemporary Politics* 23 (3): 328-347.
- Dobson, W. 2012. *The Dictator's Learning Curve: Inside the Global Battle for Democracy*. London: Harvill Secker.
- Frantz, E. and E. Stein. 2016. 'Countering Coups: Leadership Succession Rules in Dictatorships.' *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (7): 935-962.
- Geddes, B., J. Wright and E. Frantz. 2014. 'Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set.' *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (2): 313-331.
- Hufbauer, G., J. Schott and K. Elliott. 2009. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*. Washington, D.C.: Peterson Institute for International Economics.
- Huntington, S. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hyde, S. and N. Marinov. 2012. 'Which Elections Can Be Lost?' *Political Analysis* 20 (2): 191-210.
- Law, D. and M. Versteeg. 2013. 'Sham Constitutions.' *California Law Review* 101 (4): 863-952.
- Morgan, C., N. Bapat and Y. Kobayashi. 2014. 'Threat and Imposition of Economic Sanctions 1945–2005: Updating the TIES dataset.' *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 31 (5): 541-558.
- Przeworski, A. 2013. 'Political Institutions and Political Events (PIPE) Data Set.' New York: Department of Politics, New York University.

- Svolik, M. 2012. *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations. 2018a. 'Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.' Accessed 1 March 2018. Available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CHR/Pages/Membership.aspx>.
- , 2018b. 'Security Council - Veto List.' Accessed 28 January 2018. Available at <http://research.un.org/en/docs/sc/quick/veto>.
- , 2018c. 'Security Council Meetings.' Accessed 28 January 2018. Available at <http://www.un.org/en/sc/meetings/>.
- , 2018d. 'Treaty Collection.' Accessed March, 2018. Available at <https://treaties.un.org/>.
- United States Department of Justice. 2019. 'Foreign Agents Registration Act.' Accessed March, 2019. Available at <http://www.fara.gov/>.
- Walker, C. 2016. 'The Hijacking of 'Soft Power'.' *Journal of Democracy* 27 (1): 49-63.
- Wig, T., H. Hegre and P. Regan. 2015. 'Updated Data on Institutions and Elections 1960–2012: Presenting the IAEP Dataset Version 2.0.' *Research and Politics* 2 (2): 1-11.
- Wood, R. and M. Gibney. 2010. 'The Political Terror Scale (PTS): A Re-introduction and a Comparison to CIRI.' *Human Rights Quarterly* 32 (2): 367-400.
- World Bank. 2019. 'World Development Indicators.' Accessed 2 February 2019. Available at <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>.

## Data Reference List

- Abuza, Z. 2015. 'Vietnam's Rising Repression.' *New Mandala*. Accessed 22 September 2018. Available at <http://www.newmandala.org/vietnams-rising-repression/>.
- Ambinder, M. 2008. 'The DCI Group Responds on Burma.' *The Atlantic*. Accessed 19 May 2018. Available at <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2008/05/the-dci-group-responds-on-burma/53206/>.
- Anan, N. 1996. 'Chavalit Intensifies His Bid for Thailand's Premiership.' *The Wall Street Journal*. Accessed 3 September 2018. Available at <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB841697132108289500>.
- Aspinall, E. and G. Fealy. 2003. *Local Power and Politics in Indonesia*. ISEAS–Yusof Ishak Institute.
- Aspinall, E. 2005. *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia*. Stanford California: Stanford University Press.
- Barton, C. and V. Sokheng. 2008. 'Ranariddh Quits Politics.' *Phnom Penh Post*. Accessed 2 October 2018. Available at <http://www.webcitation.org/6aqEjP6jq>.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung. 2014. '*BTI 2014 — Singapore Country Report*.' Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Blitz, A. 2000. *The Contested State: American Foreign Policy and Regime Change in the Philippines*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bonner, B. 1998. 'Local Activists Condemn Death of Lao Political Prisoner.' *Saint Paul Pioneer Press*. Accessed 10 March 2018. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...1576332&parent=docview&rand=1466186736954&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- Boudreau, V. 2009. *Resisting Dictatorship: Repression and Protest in Southeast Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brownlee, J. 2008. 'Born to Rule: Party Institutions and Regime Trajectories in Malaysia and the Philippines.' *Journal of East Asian Studies* 8 (1): 89-118.
- 'Brunei: Political Structure.' 2014. *The Economist*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://country.eiu.com/article.aspx?articleid=1921620376&Country=Brunei&topic=Summary&subtopic=Political+structure>.
- 'Brunei.' 2015. In Thomas Lansford (ed.) *Political Handbook of the World 2015*: 190-192. Washington, D.C: CQ Press.
- 'Brunei Country Profile.' 2015. *BBC News*. Accessed 25 November 2015. Available at <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-pacific-12990058>.
- 'Budiman Sudjatmiko.' 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Budiman\\_Sudjatmiko](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Budiman_Sudjatmiko).

‘Burma Socialist Programme Party.’ Accessed 3 June 2016. Available at [http://america.pink/burma-socialist-programme-party\\_792045.html](http://america.pink/burma-socialist-programme-party_792045.html).

‘Burma “Worst Violator” of Internet Freedom - Watchdog.’ 2009. *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific-Political*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...4953448&parent=docview&rand=1465323887842&reloadEntirePage=true>.

‘Burma: Country Profile.’ *Australia Network – News*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.abc.net.au/australianetwork/news/countries/BURMA.htm>.

Campbell, C. 2014. ‘The Sultan of Brunei Intends to Stone Adulterers (Wait, What Century Is This?)’ *Time*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://time.com/15320/the-sultan-of-brunei-intends-to-stone-adulterers-wait-what-century-is-this/>.

Castella, J., B. Bouahom, A. Keophoxay, and L. Douangsavanh. 2011. ‘Managing the transition from farmers’ groups to agricultural cooperatives in Lao PDR.’ *The Lao Journal of Agriculture and Forestry* (23): 161-191.

Chalmers, I. 1992. ‘Loosening State Control in Singapore: The Emergence of "Local Capital" as a Political Force.’ *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 20(2): 57-84.

Chandra, A. 1999. ‘The Role of Non-State actors in ASEAN.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://www.alternative-regionalisms.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/chandra\\_non-stateactorsinasean.pdf](http://www.alternative-regionalisms.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/chandra_non-stateactorsinasean.pdf).

Celoza, A. 1997. *Ferdinand Marcos and the Philippines: The Political Economy of Authoritarianism*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Central Intelligence Agency. ‘The World Fact Book.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/la.html>.

Centre for Strategic and International Studies. 2016. ‘Government Donors.’ *Centre for Strategic and International Studies*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.csis.org/support-csis/our-donors/government-donors>.

Cesar, J. 2012. ‘Myanmar can Learn from Manila.’ *The Straits Times*. Accessed 7 June 2018. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?5246063&parent=docview&rand=1465327864182&reloadEntirePage=true>.

‘Chinese Politburo Member Pledges Closer Ties with Malaysia.’ 2012. *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific-Political*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...0876218&parent=docview&rand=1466045893425&reloadEntirePage=true>.

Chua, B. 2014. ‘Revisiting “People’s Politics” Hot Spots.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/576-revisiting-people-s-politics>.



- Clarke, G. 1998. *The Politics of NGOs in Southeast Asia. Participation and Protest in the Philippines*. London: Routledge.
- Co-Operative Department. 2016. 'Organization chart of Myanmar Cooperatives.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.myancoop.gov.mm/en/?q=CooperativeDepartment/organization-chart-myanmar-cooperatives>.
- 'Curfew Travel Ban Lifted: Martial Law Relaxed in Philippines.' 1977. *The Spokesman-Review*. Accessed 15 November 2016. Available at <https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1314&dat=19770822&id=jzxOAAAAIBAJ&sjid=1u0DAAAAIBAJ&pg=2199,2824740&hl=en>.
- Dinh Cung, N., B Van, and P Ha. 2005. 'Vietnam's Public Policy Research Institutions and Their Activities.' In T. Hashimoto, S. Hell, and S. Nam (eds.) *Public Policy Research and Training in Vietnam*: 110- 172. Hanoi: Asian Development Bank Institute.
- 'Democratic Voices of Vietnam.' *ACSC/APF 2015 – Recap. The DVOV Exhibit Booth & Remote Participation*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://dvov.org/apf2015/>.
- 'Democratic Kampuchea: The Polls of 1976.' 1998. *The Phnom Penh Post*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.phnompenhpost.com/national/democratic-kampuchea-polls-1976>.
- Devi, K. 2014. 'Myanmar under the Military Rule 1962-1988.' *International Research Journal of Social Sciences* 3(10): 46-50.
- Dhani, R., T. Lee, T. and K. Fitch. 2015. 'Political Public Relations in Indonesia: A History of Propaganda and Democracy.' *Asia Pacific Public Relations Journal* 16(1): 22-36.
- Donnan, S. 2006. 'Chain-Smoking Thorn in the Side of Indonesia's Suharto Tegime.' *Financial Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/4aa3cc78-d8ae-11da-9715-0000779e2340.html#axzz4BCHZnIVI>.
- Eklof, S. 2004. *Power and Political Culture in Suharto's Indonesia: The Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) and the Decline of the New Order (1986-98)*. New York: Routledge.
- Eng, Y. 'Forces of the Future? Youth Participation in Politics in Cambodia.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/philippinen/04526/countrypapers\\_cambodia.pdf](http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/philippinen/04526/countrypapers_cambodia.pdf).
- 'Exiled Lao Activist Recalls 1999 Protest, Says Democracy Still Attainable.' 2014. *Radio Free Asia*. 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.rfa.org/english/news/laos/exiled-activist-10292014185811.html>.

- Federal Research Division. 2006. 'Country Profile Malaysia.' *Library of Congress*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/cs/profiles/Malaysia.pdf>.
- 'Filipino Independents to Sign Pact to Help Marcos Campaign.' 1985. *The Day*. Accessed 15 November 2016. Available at [https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1915&dat=19851226&id=ukFHAAAIBAJ&sjid=m\\_gMAAAAIBAJ&pg=1300,5512224&hl=en](https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1915&dat=19851226&id=ukFHAAAIBAJ&sjid=m_gMAAAAIBAJ&pg=1300,5512224&hl=en).
- 'Filipino Officers defect to join opposition.' 1985. *New Straits Times*. Accessed 23 November 2018. Available at <https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1309&dat=19851123&id=M-pLAAAIBAJ&sjid=w40DAAAIBAJ&pg=6944,5650326&hl=en>.
- 'Foreign Government Contributions to Nine Think Tanks.' 2014. *The New York Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/09/07/us/politics/foreign-government-contributions-to-nine-think-tanks.html>.
- Freedom House. 1998. *Brunei*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/1998/brunei>
- , 2008. *Thailand*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2008/thailand>.
- , 2015. *Singapore*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/singapore>.
- , 2015. *Malaysia: Freedom on the Net*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [www.freedomhouse.org](http://www.freedomhouse.org).
- , 2015. *Cambodia: Freedom on the Net*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2015/cambodia>.
- , 2016. *Laos: Country Report*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://freedomhouse.org/report/laos>.
- 'From Team Hilary to Vietnam Lobbyist: Did a lobbying firm close to Hillary Clinton help seal the deal to lift the U.S. arms embargo with Vietnam?' 2016. *The Daily Beast*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/05/25/from-team-hillary-to-vietnam-lobbyist.html>.
- Fry, S. 2012. 'The Lao federation of Trade Unions: A Classic Dualist Union.' *International Journal of Employment Studies* 20(2): 32-55.
- Glass, A. 1986. 'Indonesia in growing less poor, but certainly not less autocratic.' *Star- News*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1454&dat=19860504&id=hMUxAAAIBAJ&sjid=1RMEAAAIBAJ&pg=2784,980879&hl=en>.

- ‘Give full support to co-op federation.’ 2007. *The Brunei Times*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at [http://www.bt.com.bn/home\\_news/2007/12/03/give\\_full\\_support\\_to\\_co\\_op\\_federation](http://www.bt.com.bn/home_news/2007/12/03/give_full_support_to_co_op_federation).
- Gosh, N. 2016. ‘New MPs to inherit host of issues in Myanmar; Incoming NLD gov’t faces many problems such as land rights, graft.’ *The Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...4797218&parent=docview&rand=1465321820690&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- Gottesman, E. 2003. *Cambodia after the Khmer Rouge: Inside the politics of nation building*. New York: Yale University Press.
- Government of Malaysia. 2010. ‘Malaysia: Malaysia APCO Worldwide Inc.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.pogo.org/tools-and-data/foreign-influence-database/data/254048-malaysia-apco-worldwide-inc-government-of.html>
- ‘Governments Bans Dissidents from Travel Abroad.’ 1991. *Associated Press*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.library.ohiou.edu/indopubs/1991/05/07/0012.html>.
- Hadiwinata, B.S. 2003. *The Politics of NGOs in Indonesia: Developing Democracy and Managing a Movement*. London: Routledge.
- Hadiz, V. and Robinson, R. 2004. *Reorganising Power in Indonesia: The Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets*. London: Routledge.
- Hansen, A. 2016. ‘Politics in Contemporary Vietnam: Party, State and Authority Relations.’ *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 46(1): 143-146.
- Harriden, J. 2012. *The Authority of Influence: Women and Power in Burmese History*. Copenhagen: NIAS Press.
- Harisumarto, S. 1991. ‘Indonesian Minister backs ban on Dissidents.’ *UDI*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at: <https://www.library.ohiou.edu/indopubs/1991/05/07/0011.html>.
- Hassan, S and Weiss M. (eds.). 2012. *Social Movement Malaysia*. New York: Routledge
- Hasanah, M. 2015. ‘National Cooperatives Day 2015.’ *Voices of Indonesia: Informing, Connecting, Dignifying*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://www.en.voi.co.id/voi-features/9400-national-cooperatives-day-2015>.
- ‘Hindraf leader's travel ban lifted.’ 2012. *New Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...8403690&parent=docview&rand=1465746281757&reloadEntirePage=true>.

- ‘Hmong: Mass Arrests of 346 Protesters in Laos.’ 2009. *Media Newswire*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.unpo.org/article/10296>.
- Hoang, D. 2014. ‘Vietnamese Government “Opinion Shapers” Target Activist Facebook Pages.’ *Global Voices Advocacy*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://advox.globalvoices.org/2014/07/18/vietnamese-government-opinion-shapers-target-activist-facebook-pages/>.
- Holst, F. 2012. *Ethnicization and Identity Construction in Malaysia*. London: Routledge.
- Hoong, C.M. 1999. ‘What's Chee up to now?’ *The Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...4970818&parent=docview&rand=1466366488761&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- Hopkins, J. 2014. ‘Cybertroopers and tea parties: government use of the Internet in Malaysia.’ *Asian Journal of Communication* 24(1):5-24.
- Hussainmiya, B. ‘Brunei Darussalam: A Nation at Peace.’ Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at [https://www.bsp.com.bn/panagaclub/pnhs\\_old/history/BRUNEI%20DARUSSALAM.htm](https://www.bsp.com.bn/panagaclub/pnhs_old/history/BRUNEI%20DARUSSALAM.htm).
- Human Rights Watch. 2010. ‘Burma: Military Party Guaranteed to Dominate Elections Merger of Two Junta-Backed Groups Undercuts Genuine Participation.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.hrw.org/news/2010/07/19/burma-military-party-guaranteed-dominate-elections>.
- , 2010. ‘Cambodia: Opposition Leader Sam Rainsy’s Trial a Farce. Conviction Demonstrates Continuing Persecution of Critics, Political Control of Judiciary.’ Accessed 28 January 2018. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <https://www.hrw.org/news/2010/01/28/cambodia-opposition-leader-sam-rainsys-trial-farce>.
- , 1998. ‘Indonesia and East Timor: The Prisoners Released So Far.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.hrw.org/news/1998/08/26/indonesia-and-east-timor-prisoner-releases-so-far>.
- , 1996. ‘Indonesia Tough International Response needed to Widening Crackdown.’ *Asia: Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Center for Human Rights* 8(8). Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1996/Indonesi2.htm>.
- , 1996. ‘Indonesia: Election Monitoring and Human Rights.’ *Asia: Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Center for Human Rights* 8(5) Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://hrw.org/reports/1996/Indonesi1.htm>.
- , 1992. ‘Indonesia and East Timor: Human Rights Developments.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1992/WR92/ASW-08.htm>.

- Hutt, D. 2016. 'Region's Governments Flash Cash at US lobbying Firms.' *Southeast Asia Globe*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://sea-globe.com/19497-2-lobbying-southeast-asia/>.
- Idrus, A. 2016. 'PVATM to Continue its Struggle for Welfare of Veterans.' *New Sarawak Tribune*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.newsarawaktribune.com/news/55702/PVATM-to-continue-its-struggle-for-welfare-of-veterans/>.
- 'Indonesia: Nongovernment Organizations (NGOs).' 1993. In W. Frederick and R. Worden (eds.) *Indonesia: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://countrystudies.us/indonesia/>.
- 'Indonesia: The Structures of Government.' 1993. In W. Frederick and R. Worden (eds.) *Indonesia: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://countrystudies.us/indonesia/>.
- 'Indonesia.' 2015. In T. Lansford (ed.) *Political Handbook of the World 2015*: 653-663 Washington D.C.: CQ Press. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://library.cqpress.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/phw/document.php?id=phw2015\\_Indonesiasia&type=toc&num=80](http://library.cqpress.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/phw/document.php?id=phw2015_Indonesiasia&type=toc&num=80).
- 'In the Political Wilderness. Hatta is the Kingdom's only Local Critic.' *AsiaNow - Asia week*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://edition.cnn.com/ASIANOW/asiaweek/98/1016/nat3.html>.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union. 2008. *Lao People's Democratic Republic. Sapha Heng Xat (National Assembly)*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2175\\_arc.htm](http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2175_arc.htm).
- Institute of Strategic and International Studies. 2016. 'Introduction.' *Malaysia: Institute of Strategic and International Studies*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.isis.org.my/index.php/aboutus/about-isis/introduction>.
- International Co-operative Alliance Asia and Pacific. 'Logo and Name of the Member Organization.' *Co-operative League of Thailand*. Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at <http://ica-ap.coop/sites/ica-ap.coop/files/CLT-Thailand.pdf> 23 November 2016.
- International Center for Not-For-Profit-Law. 2016. *NGO Law Monitor: Malaysia*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.icnl.org/research/monitor/malaysia.html>.
- Islam in Indonesia. 2014. 'The Formation of ICMI, All-Indonesian Association of Muslim Intellectuals (1990).' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://islaminindonesia.com/2014/03/15/the-formation-of-icmi-all-indonesian-association-of-muslim-intellectuals-1990/>.
- 'Is the Singapore Environment Council Truly a Civil Society Organisation?' 2016. *The Online Citizen*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.theonlinecitizen.com/blog/2016/05/03/singapore-environment-council->

[truly-civil-society-organisation/](#).

- Jacob, P. 2013. 'Trainee Teachers in Protest against Abri-linked Groups.' *The Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...5417194&parent=docview&rand=1465591418623&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- Jesnes, K. 2014. 'Developing Relations: Political Parties and Civil Society in Myanmar.' *Norway: Noref Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre*. Accessed 20 November 2016. Available at [http://noref.no/var/ezflow\\_site/storage/original/application/1dca6db8cbb10f8810a5146b96715142.pdf](http://noref.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/1dca6db8cbb10f8810a5146b96715142.pdf).
- Jonsson, K. 2002. 'Globalization, Authoritarian Regimes and Political Change: Vietnam and Laos.' In Catarina Kinnvall and Kristina Jönsson (eds.) *Globalization and Democratization in Asia: The Construction of Identity*: 114- 130. New York: Routledge.
- Joo, N. 1996. 'Young PAP Plays Crucial Role in Coming Election.' *The Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/delivery...04435%2Fformatted\\_doc&fromCart=false&jobHandle=1826%3A566204435](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/delivery...04435%2Fformatted_doc&fromCart=false&jobHandle=1826%3A566204435).
- Karlsson, I. 2013. 'LICADHO Welcomes the Release of Mam Sonando.' *Diakonia*. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <http://www.diakonia.se/en/Info/News--Publications/News-archive-2013/LICADHO-release-Mam-Sonando/>.
- Karlsson, I. 2014. 'Cambodia: Human Rights Activists Imprisoned.' *Diakonia*. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <http://www.diakonia.se/en/Info/News--Publications/Latest-news/cambodia-human-rights-activists-imprisoned/>.
- Kashuerin, S. 2015. 'Penang says 'No' to Term Limit on CM.' *Free Malaysia Today*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.freemalaysiatoday.com/category/nation/2015/05/13/penang-says-no-to-term-limit-on-cm/>.
- Kawanaka, T. 2002. 'The Philippines: From Agents to Political Actors.' In S. Shigetomi (ed.) *The State and NGOs: Perspectives from Asia*: 110-124. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Khoo, S. 1998. 'Think Tanks and Intellectual Participation in Malaysian Discourses of Development.' In D. Stone, A. Denham and M. Garnett (eds.) *Think Tanks across Nations: A Comparative Approach*: 166-87. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kongkea, B. 2014. 'Lawsuits Still Dog Opposition Leader.' *The Phnom Penh Post*. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <http://www.phnompenhpost.com/national/lawsuits-still-dog-opposition-leader>.
- Kurasawa, A. 2009. 'Swaying between State and Community: The Role of RT/RW in Post-Suharto Indonesia.' In B. Read and R. Pekkanen (eds.) *Local Organizations and Urban*



*Governance in East and Southeast Asia: Straddling State and Society*: 58-84. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Kurlantzick, J. 2016. 'Violence Flares in Laos.' *The Diplomat*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://thediplomat.com/2016/01/violence-flares-in-laos/>.

Kyaw, K. 2015. 'All International Observers Welcome to Myanmar Election: UES.' *Myanmar Eleven*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://www.nationmultimedia.com/aec/All-international-observers-welcomed-to-Myanmar-el-30268031.html>.

'LA21 Programme Showing Signs of Success.' 2003. *New Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...0696121&parent=docview&rand=1466042314768&reloadEntirePage=true>.

'Labour Market-Oriented Vocational Training in the VCA Network.' 2014. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...9573917&parent=docview&rand=1465502211769&reloadEntirePage=true>.

'Laos.' 2015. In T. Lansford (ed.) *Political Handbook of the World 2015*. Washington D.C: CQ Press.

'Lao Front for National Construction.' *Introduction on the Lao Front for National Construction*. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at [http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session8/LA/LFNC\\_UPR\\_LAO\\_S08\\_2010\\_LaoFrontforNationalConstruction.pdf](http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session8/LA/LFNC_UPR_LAO_S08_2010_LaoFrontforNationalConstruction.pdf).

'Lao People's Revolutionary Youth Union.' Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <http://www.geocities.ws/laopys/LPRUY.htm>.

Lao People's Democratic Republic. 2003. *On the Promulgation of the Amended Constitution of the Lao People's Democratic Republic*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/la/la009en.pdf>.

'Lao Legislators to Set President, Prime Minister Candidates.' 2016. *Shanghai Daily*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://www.shanghaidaily.com/article/article\\_xinhua.aspx?id=326484](http://www.shanghaidaily.com/article/article_xinhua.aspx?id=326484).

'Lao National Television.' 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lao\\_National\\_Television](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lao_National_Television).

'Laos: National Police and Paramilitary Forces.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.country-data.com/frd/cs/latoc.html#la0179>.

Leifer, M. 2013. *Dictionary of the Modern Politics of Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.

Lee, T. 2002. 'The Politics of Civil Society in Singapore.' *Asian Studies Review* 26(1): 97-117.

- ‘Lessons Learned: How you Prepare a Youth Policy and Avoid it being Hijacked by International Agencies!’ 2013. *ActionAid*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.actionaid.org/activista/2013/02/lessons-learned-how-you-prepare-youth-policy-and-avoiding-it-being-hijacked>.
- Lian, H. 2010. ‘[Singapore] Defeating Rivals through Defamation Lawsuits.’ *SEAPA – Southeast Asian Press Alliance*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.seapa.org/defeating-rivals-through-defamation-lawsuits/>.
- Logue. 2011. ‘Lao People’s Revolutionary Youth Union Pledges to Serve the Nation.’ *Lao News*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://khamerlogue.wordpress.com/category/lao-%E2%80%8Bnews/>.
- Lwin, S. 2015. ‘Academics Hope to Enter into the Fold.’ *The Myanmar Times*. Accessed 7 June 2016. Available at <http://www.mmtimes.com/index.php/national-news/yangon/19024-academics-hope-to-enter-into-the-fold.html>.
- Maguire, P. 2012. *Facing Death in Cambodia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Malaysian National Co-operative Movement. ‘History of Angkasa.’ Available at <http://www.angkasa.coop/english/index.php/layout/main-content-only>.
- ‘Malaysia.’ 2015. In T. Lansford (ed.) *Political Handbook of the World 2015*. Washington D.C: CQ Press.
- Mauzy, D. 2002. ‘Electoral Innovation and One-Party Dominance in Singapore.’ In J. Hsieh and D. Newman (eds.) *How Asia Votes*: 234-254. United Kingdom: Chatham House Publishers.
- Mehta, H. and J. Mehta. 2013. *Strongman the Extraordinary Life of Hun Sen: From Pagoda Boy to Prime Minister of Cambodia*. Singapore: Marshall Cavendish Editions.
- ‘Military: Village Scouts.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/thailand/village-scouts.htm>.
- ‘Military: People’s Action Party (PAP).’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/singapore/pap.htm>.
- Ministry of Social and Family Development. 2016. ‘Singapore National Co-operative Federation.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://app.msf.gov.sg/Policies/Archived-Topics/Caring-and-Active-C...t/Co-operative-Societies/Singapore-National-Co-operative-Federation>.
- Moorehead, C. 1992. ‘Vietnam's Confusing Signals on Critics; Rights and Wrongs.’ *The Independent*. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...6349764&parent=docview&rand=1470409238136&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- Myoe, M. 2009. *Building the Tatmadaw: Myanmar Armed Forces since 1948*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.





<https://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/StateandRegionGovernmentsinMyanmarCESDTAF.PDF>.

O'Rourke, K. 2002. *Reformasi: The Struggle for Power in Post-Soeharto Indonesia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

'Over Facebook "Insult" Kachin Man Charged.' 2015. *Legal Monitor Worldwide*. Accessed 7 June 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...5480720&parent=docview&rand=1465330933534&reloadEntirePage=true>.

Oxford Burma Alliance. 'The Ne Win Years: 1962-1988.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.oxfordburmaalliance.org/1962-coup--ne-win-regime.html>.

'Online Burma/Myanmar Library.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.burmalibrary.org/show.php?cat=3199>.

Ong, A., and E. Toh. 2013. 'AMP Director Quits, Alleging Official Pressure; But Minister and Association Chairman Deny Interference with its Management.' *The Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...0109748&parent=docview&rand=1470320380>.

'Pagoda Boys.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://vimeo.com/51409299>.

Chagnon, P., R. Rumpf, and B. Van Gansberghe. 2003. 'Government and Participation in Laos.' *SIDA, Asia Division*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://www.sida.se/contentassets/136b3ec257224f139b85f926bccd4e48/governance-and-participation-in-laos\\_577.pdf](http://www.sida.se/contentassets/136b3ec257224f139b85f926bccd4e48/governance-and-participation-in-laos_577.pdf).

Pepinsky, T. 2009. *Economic Crises and the Breakdown of Authoritarian Regimes: Indonesia and Malaysia in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Perinova, M. 2005. *Civil Society in Authoritarian Regimes: The Analysis of China, Burma and Vietnam*, Lund University: Department of Political Science. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=1330580&fileOId=1330581>.

Pheap, A. and S. Henderson. 2013. 'Flying the CPP Flag, 'Pagoda Boys' Have Mixed Allegiances.' *The Cambodia Daily*. Accessed 6 November 2016. Available at 19 July <https://www.cambodiadaily.com/elections/flying-the-cpp-flag-pagoda-boys-have-mixed-allegiances-35718/>.

Pobre C. 2013. 'The PVAO: A Historical Perspective.' *Philippines: Philippine Veterans Affairs Office*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://server.pvao.mil.ph/SiteHistory.aspx>.

'Politics of Brunei—Legislative Branch.' Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at [http://www.liquisearch.com/politics\\_of\\_brunei/legislative\\_branch](http://www.liquisearch.com/politics_of_brunei/legislative_branch).

- Pratkanis, A. 2009. 'Public Diplomacy in International Conflicts: A Social Influence Analysis.' In N. Snow and P. Taylor (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*: 111-153. New York: Routledge.
- 'Presidential Term Limits Discussed at Constitution-Amendment Seminar.' 2014. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://jclao.com/presidential-term-limits-discussed-constitution-amendment-seminar/>.
- Press, E. 1997. 'The Suharto Lobby.' *Albion Monitor*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.albionmonitor.com/9711b/suhartolobby.html>.
- 'Radio Singapore International.' 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio\\_Singapore\\_International](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio_Singapore_International).
- 'Radio Thailand World Service.' 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio\\_Thailand\\_World\\_Service](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio_Thailand_World_Service).
- 'Radio Televisyen Malaysia.' 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio\\_Televisyen\\_Malaysia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio_Televisyen_Malaysia).
- 'Rainsy Lawsuit Filed over Cambodia-Vietnam Border Map.' 2012. *Radio Australia*. Accessed 6 November 2016. Available at <http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/international/2010-02-26/rainsy-lawsuit-filed-over-cambodiavietnam-border-map/199970>.
- 'REACHSingapore.' 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/REACHSingapore>.
- 'Recent Events Indicate Burma to Further Tighten Internet Control.' 2011. *BBC Monitoring World Media*. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...4964803&parent=docview&rand=1465323918825&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- 'Rela "Should not be Disbanded because of a Few Bad Hats."' 2007. *New Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...0117740&parent=docview&rand=1466028650335&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- Robison, R. 2012. *Routledge Handbook of Southeast Asian Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Rodan, G. 2004. *Transparency and Authoritarian Rule in Southeast Asia: Singapore and Malaysia*. New York: Routledge.
- Ross, J. 1990. 'Militia Abuses in the Philippines.' *Third World Legal Studies* 9(7): 171- 203.
- Ryter, L. 2001. 'Pemuda Pancasila: The Last Loyalist Free Men of Suharto's Order?' In B. Anderson (ed.), *Violence and the State in Suharto's Indonesia*. Ithaca, New York: Southeast Asia Program Publications.

- Samean, Y. 2008. 'Ranariddh Pardoned, Expected to Return Sunday.' *The Cambodia Daily*. Accessed 5 November 2016. Available at <http://www.webcitation.org/6dfdtc2vt>.
- , Y. 2003. 'Pagoda Boys Propagate the Hun Sen Faith.' *The Cambodia Daily*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.cambodiadaily.com/archives/pagoda-boys-propagate-the-hun-sen-faith-2-23235/>.
- 'Sanngguniang Kabataan: Youth Council.' 2016. Accessed 24 November. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sangguniang\\_Kabataan&oldid=711864312](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sangguniang_Kabataan&oldid=711864312)
- Schwarz, A. 1999. *A Nation in Waiting: Indonesia's Search for Stability*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Serrano, I. 2003. 'Civil Society in the Philippines: Struggling for Sustainability.' *Civil Society in Asia*: 103-113. Hampshire England: Ashgate.
- Shugart, S. 2015. 'Singapore and the People's Action Party.' *The Meridian Journal: The Student Run Journal of International and Cross- Cultural Perspectives*. Accessed 15 November 2016. Available at <https://lcmjournal.com/2015/02/13/singapore-and-the-peoples-action-party/>.
- Sidhu, J. 2010. 'Human Rights Violations in Myanmar and the Military Junta's Defensive Human Rights Diplomacy.' *Journal of International Studies* 6: Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://www.jis.uum.edu.my/images/pdf/6jis/jis20101.pdf>.
- Sim, C. 2011. 'The Singapore Chill: Political Defamation and the Normalization of a Statist Rule of Law.' *Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal* 20(2): 319- 353.
- 'Singapore.' 2015. In T. Lansford (ed.) *Political Handbook of the World 2015*. Washington, D.C: CQ Press.
- Singapore National Co-operative Federation. 2014. 'The Co-operative Movement Making the Difference for More than 88 years.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.sncf.org.sg/web/sncf/about-us/history/making-the-difference>.
- 'Singaporean NGO Plans to Monitor Forthcoming General Elections.' 2011. *Hindustan Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>.
- Singapore Institute of International Affairs. 2016 'About the ASEAN Institute of Strategic and International Studies.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.siiiaonline.org/page/isis/>.
- Skidmore, M. 2005. *Burma at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Slater, D. 2003. 'Iron Cage in an Iron Fist: Authoritarian Institutions and the Personalization of Power in Malaysia.' *Comparative Politics* 36(1): 81-101.

- , 2012. 'Strong-State Democratization in Malaysia and Singapore.' *Journal of Democracy* 23(2): 19-33.
- Smith, J. 1998. 'Burma's Image Problem is a Money Maker for U.S. Lobbyists.' *The Washington Post*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1998/02/24/burmas...oneymaker-for-us-lobbyists/f9fcb73a-d83f-4d02-a144-61a7843fe2c7/>.
- Sokchea, M. 2015. 'From the NEC to Government.' *The Phnom Penh Post*. Accessed 4 November 2016. Available at <http://www.phnompenhpost.com/national/nec-government>.
- Sokheng, V. 2006. 'Chakrapong says Court tool of the Ruling Parties.' *The Phnom Penh Post*. Accessed at 5 November 2016. Available at <http://www.webcitation.org/6aqEcXUzT>.
- Sophirom, K. 2013. 'Cambodian Youth Association: Sunday's National Election is Free, Fair and Peaceful.' *AKP Phnom Penh*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.akp.gov.kh/?p=35016>.
- 'Who Owns the Media: Media Ownership Monitor.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://mom-kh.com/en/radio\\_media/13](http://mom-kh.com/en/radio_media/13).
- Stone, D. 2002. 'Dynamics of Think Tank Development in Southeast Asia, Australia, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea.' In J. McGann R. and Weaver (eds.) *Think tanks and Civil Societies: Catalysts for Ideas and Action*: 383-410. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Storey, I. 2005. 'China and Vietnam's Tug of War over Laos.' *China Brief* 5(13). Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at <https://jamestown.org/program/china-and-vietnams-tug-of-war-over-laos/>.
- Stuart-Fox, M. 1986. *Laos: Politics, Economics and Society*. London: Frances Pinter Publishers.
- Strangio, S. 2014. *Hun Sen's Cambodia*. New York: Yale University Press.
- Suryani, D. 2015. 'Defending Democracy: Citizen Participation in Election Monitoring in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia.' *Journal Studi Pemerintahan: Journal of Government and Politics* 6(1): 1-17.
- 'Suu Kyi Warns against Misuse of Social Media Victims "Must be Given Chance" to Defend Themselves.' 2012. *The Nation*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...5480724&parent=docview&rand=1465330940359&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- Taylor, W., Nguyen Thu Hang, Phạm Quang Tu, and Huynh Thị Ngọc Tuyet. 2012. 'Civil Society in Vietnam: A Comparative Study of Civil Society Organizations in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City.' *The Asia Foundation*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <https://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/CivilSocietyReportFINALweb.pdf>.

- ‘Television in Singapore.’ 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Television\\_in\\_Singapore&oldid=727994665](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Television_in_Singapore&oldid=727994665).
- ‘Televisi Republik Indonesia.’ 2016. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/TVRI>.
- ‘Civil Society in Laos Gone Missing.’ 2013. *The Economist*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.economist.com/blogs/banyan/2013/01/civil-society-laos>.
- Thanh, V. 2011. ‘Vietnam: the Redemptorists Superior Banned from Leaving the Country.’ *NamViet News*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://namvietnews.wordpress.com/2011/07/14/vietnam-the-redemptorists-superior-banned-from-leaving-the-country/>.
- ‘Thailand: Critics Slam Govt’s Plan to Hire U.S. PR company.’ 2007. *Bangkok Post*. Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at <http://www.international.ucla.edu/asia/article/69022>.
- Thayer, C. 2014. ‘The Apparatus of Authoritarian rule in Vietnam.’ In J. London (ed.) *Politics in Contemporary Vietnam*: 135-161. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- The Public International Law & Policy Group. 2010. ‘The 2010 Burmese Elections: Neither Free nor Fair.’ *Election Monitoring Report*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at [http://publicinternationallawandpolicygroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/PILPG\\_Burma\\_Elections\\_Monitoring\\_Report\\_8\\_November\\_2010.pdf](http://publicinternationallawandpolicygroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/PILPG_Burma_Elections_Monitoring_Report_8_November_2010.pdf).
- The Central Committee of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union. ‘History of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union.’ Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://english.doanthanhvien.vn/Article-detail/Hcyu/16874/history-of-the-ho-chi-minh-communist-youth-union.htm>.
- ‘The People’s Volunteer Corps.’ 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://www.wikiwand.com/en/The\\_People's\\_Volunteer\\_Corps](http://www.wikiwand.com/en/The_People's_Volunteer_Corps).
- ‘Timeline: Myanmar’s Slow Road to a New Constitution.’ 2008. *Reuters*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-myanmar-elections-constitution-idUKBKK26169420080209>.
- Tonkin, D. 2007. ‘The 1990 Elections in Myanmar: Broken promises or a Failure of Communication?’ *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 29(1): 33-54.
- Tremewan, C. 1996. *The Political Economy of Social Control in Singapore*. London: Macmillan.
- Tur, T. 2015. ‘Nam Dinh Provincial Police Received the Title of Hero of the People's Armed Forces.’ *Nhan Dan*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.nhandan.com.vn/chinhtri/tin-tuc-su-kien/item/27386302-cong-an-t%E1%BB%89nh-nam-d%E1%BB%8Bnh-d%C3%B3n-nh%E1%BA%A1n-danh-h%E1%BA%B9u-anh-h%C3%B9ng-l%E1%BB%A5c-lu%E1%BB%8Dng-v%C5%A9-trang-nhan-dan.html>.



- Ufen, A. 2009. 'The Transformation of Political Party Opposition in Malaysia and its Implications for the Electoral Authoritarian Regime.' *Democratization* 16(3): 604-627.
- 'Umno and Golkar Agree to Boost Relations.' 1991. *New Straits Times*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at <https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1309&dat=19911117&id=zGJPAAAAIBAJ&sjid=OJADAAAAIBAJ&pg=6901,487470&hl=en>.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. 'The Director General of UNESCO Celebrates the Release of Two Political Prisoners from Lao.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL\\_ID=24186&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL_ID=24186&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html).
- United Nations. 2005. 'Lao People's Democratic Republic, Public Administration: Country Profile.' *Division for Public Administration and Development Management*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan023237.pdf>.
- US-ASEAN Academy. *Centre for Economic and Social Development, Myanmar Development Research Institute*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.asean-sme-academy.org/resource/centre-for-economic-and-social-development-myanmar-development-research-institute/>.
- United States Department of State. 2014. 'Vietnam 2013 Human Rights Report.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/220456.pdf>.
- United States Department of State. 2012. 'Laos Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2011.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/186495.pdf>.
- Vasavakul, T. 2014. 'Authoritarianism Reconfigured: Evolving Accountability Relations within Vietnam's One-Party Rule.' In J. London (ed.) *Politics in Contemporary Vietnam: Party, State and Authority Relations*: 42-63. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vatikiotis, M. 1998. *Indonesian Politics under Suharto: The Rise and Fall of the New Order*. New York: Routledge.
- Vietnam Embassy. 2016. 'Viet Nam, Laos Parties Committed to Special Ties.' Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [http://www.vietnamembassy-seoul.org/vnemb.vn/tin\\_hddn/ns061011095544](http://www.vietnamembassy-seoul.org/vnemb.vn/tin_hddn/ns061011095544).
- 'Vietnam: Restrictions on Freedom of Movement Violate Domestic and International Law.' 2015. *Civil Rights Defenders*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <https://www.civilrightsdefenders.org/news/vietnam-restrictions-on-h...fenders-freedom-of-movement-violate-domestic-and-international-law/>.

- ‘Vietnamese Activist Barred from Leaving Country to Visit Sick Mother.’ 2014. *Radio Free Asia*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.rfa.org/english/news/vietnam/activist-09032014145623.html>
- ‘Vietnam Television (VTV).’ 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vietnam\\_Television](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vietnam_Television).
- ‘Vietnam.’ 2015. In T. Lansford (ed.) *Political Handbook of the World 2015*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- ‘Vietnamese Buddhist Dissident Laid to Rest – Kyodo.’ 2008. *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific – Political*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...6349710&parent=docview&rand=1470409152528&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- ‘Voice of Malaysia.’ 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voice\\_of\\_Malaysia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voice_of_Malaysia).
- ‘Voice of Vietnam.’ 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voice\\_of\\_Vietnam](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voice_of_Vietnam).
- ‘Voice of Indonesia.’ 2016. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voice\\_of\\_Indonesia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voice_of_Indonesia).
- Wallace, C. 1992. ‘Protesters Pull Back in Thailand: Unrest: Crowd Leaves when Troops Fire into Air on Third Day of Violence. U.S. Criticizes the Government’s Use of Force.’ *LA Times*. Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at [http://articles.latimes.com/1992-05-20/news/mn-249\\_1\\_security-forces](http://articles.latimes.com/1992-05-20/news/mn-249_1_security-forces).
- ‘War Veterans Organization Act. B.E. 2510.’ 1967. Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at <http://www.thailaws.com/>.
- Wells- Dang, A. 2012. *Civil Society Networks in China and Vietnam: Informal Pathbreakers in Health and the Environment*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wei, K. 2013. ‘No to Exploiting NGOs, VWOs for Political Ends.’ *The Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at [https://www.mccy.gov.sg/en/news/Replies-Forum-letters/2013/Apr/No\\_to\\_exploiting\\_NGOs\\_VWOs\\_for\\_political\\_ends.aspx](https://www.mccy.gov.sg/en/news/Replies-Forum-letters/2013/Apr/No_to_exploiting_NGOs_VWOs_for_political_ends.aspx).
- Weiss, M. 2003. ‘Malaysian NGOs: History, Legal Framework and Characteristics.’ In S. Hassan and M. Weiss (eds.) *Social Movements in Malaysia: from moral communities to NGOs*: 17-44. London: Routledge.
- , M. 2006. *Protest and Possibilities: Civil Society and Coalitions for Political Change in Malaysia*. California: Stanford University Press.
- ‘What's the Stand on Politicians Serving in NGOs and VWOs.’ 2013. *The Straits Times*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...0092724&parent=docview&rand=1470320205346&reloadEntirePage=true>.



- ‘Wikileaks: Malaysia’s Most Prominent Think Tanks.’ 2011. *Malaysia Today*. Accessed 24 November 2016. Available at <http://www.malaysia-today.net/wikileaks-malaysias-most-prominent-think-tanks/>.
- Wurfel, D. 1991. *Filipino Politics: Development and Decay*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.
- Young, J. 2008. ‘Chee Siok Chin Takes 'Travel Ban' Case to Court; Hearing to Determine if Official Assignee's Decision on US trip Should be Reviewed.’ *The Straits Times*. Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at <http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?...4964743&parent=docview&rand=1466366161299&reloadEntirePage=true>.
- ‘Young Pap.’ 2015. Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Young\\_PAP&oldid=677421781](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Young_PAP&oldid=677421781).
- Yunos, R. 2009. ‘Brunei’s Legislative Council.’ *The Brunei Times*. Accessed 25 November 2016. Available at [http://www.bt.com.bn/golden\\_legacy/2009/03/15/bruneis\\_legislative\\_council](http://www.bt.com.bn/golden_legacy/2009/03/15/bruneis_legislative_council).
- Xueying, L. 2007. ‘PAP Moves to Counter Criticism of Party, Gov’t in Cyberspace.’ Accessed 23 November 2016. Available at <http://singabloodypore.blogspot.com/2007/02/pap-moves-to-counter-criticism-of-party.html>.
- Vickery, M. 1986. *Cambodia after Angkor: The Chronicular Evidence for the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries*. New York: Yale University.