

Social Engineering on Cultural Capital: An Alternative Understanding to Build Strong Community Engagement within ASEAN Countries

Abdullah Sumrahadi*

*School of Multimedia Technology and Communication,
College of Arts and Science,
Universiti Utara Malaysia & Co-founder Asia Pacific Society
for Public Affairs*

Ratnawati Yuni Suryandari

*School of Government, College of Law, Government
and International Studies,
Universiti Utara Malaysia*

*Corresponding author; email: abdullahsumrahadi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Since its initial establishment, ASEAN aspires to realize the unity of Southeast Asia, and expand its membership. At the same time, ASEAN faces new problems with the expansion of membership due to increased responsibilities and potential internal disputes such as border issues, illegal labor migration, and environmental issues. ASEAN leaders agreed to have a commitment to create One Caring and Sharing Community in 2015, five years earlier than planned in Kuala Lumpur in 1997, and to disseminate to the people of ASEAN to have the “we feeling.” For the next ASEAN Community will be colored by achievement of cooperation, solidarity, together against poverty, and enjoy a sense of security, increased awareness of environmental hygiene, including human security. Through this study will be see how the cultural linkages become social capital. In which social capital derive from culture values traced from the respective involved members to form a new power.

Keywords: *social capital, cultural, cultural studies, innovation*

INTRODUCTION: THEORETICAL GROUNDBREAKING

Before we produce further explanation around our focus on social capital, as an introduction we will discuss on the basic understanding about culture and cultural studies in the sense of theoretical works. In a very brief conditions we define that culture is the knowledge, values, beliefs, traditions, spirituality, emotive features, material products, lifestyles, and notions of community that exist in a society, as O'Leary (2007: 52) states in her book. Realizing that culture has been controversial in definition and arguable more interesting than understanding culture as a widely social science construct is exploring the "effects" of culture to our world. Some interesting work and discussion we can found on Bennett (2005) and Griswold (2003) work, which provides a longer explanation than O'Leary's (2007: 52) argument.

They say "culture" is notoriously hard to simplify to a single definition. We think this cause is because culture not only surrounds us, but also molds us. Therefore, culture is socially constructed. A few Social groups also construct culture in a variety of ways—, which leads to plurality across the world and even neighborhoods. Infants have limited knowledge when they're born, but before they set foot in school they're not only familiar with the food, values, spirituality, language, and family structures that define their culture, it's actually this social heritage that defines them as individuals. Perhaps this is why culture is so hard for us to see, also so hard to for us to define, yet is so staunchly defended when under threat. Not only is it embedded in individuals as true and natural, it also creates an individual's understanding about themselves, others, and the world that surrounds them.

Hereinafter the preceding discussion on the term of culture should enable us to see that culture is ubiquitous, complex, and most of all difficult to define. According to Harrison and Huntington (2000: xv) argument, "the term 'culture,' of course, has had multiple meanings in different disciplines and different contexts." Refer to the classical effort of Kroeber and Kluckhohn, the elusive nature of term perhaps best reflected in the fact that as early of 1952 a review on the anthropology literature revealed around 164 different definitions of the word *culture* (Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel, 2010: 23). The media also uses the word of culture to portray aspects of individual sophistication in more aspects in everyday life and human interactions.

Essentially, culture is everything that is socially rather than biologically, learned and shared. It is what give power and us meaning and offers us a way to relate to our world. However, this can cause us become quite ethnocentric where we see our own culture as inherently superior to all others. In fact, a tremendous amount of global bloodshed, terrorism, war, genocide has its root, a need to define, defend, spread, devalue, and destroy cultures.

Recently and later become the main focus and discussion menu of this paper is, when exploring other cultures—perhaps which allow us to “hear and see” our own culture—meant travelling far and very wide. Now we live in ever shrinking world full of multicultural communities in which cultures are increasingly visible, and often represent issues to be engage. The importance of culture to a community is the challenges of managing cultural complexity, and the role of culture in regional and global conflict makes this an extremely important social science construct.

Therefore, to know the more debates and controversies on culture in this short session we will put a little discussion about cultural studies to help us in understanding the scope of the study of culture in a more wide perspective. Cultural studies is a highly diverse area of inquiry that includes a wide array of approaches, method, and perspectives. Proponent thinkers argue that this is strength, and that the breadth of cultural studies comes from the need to open up traditional discipline. However, others argue that cultural studies lacks a distinct and coherent disciplinary core, and have even accused it of being an academic fad that fails to address fundamental questions of social life. Referring to the previous information O’Leary (2007: 50) with briefly define that cultural studies is “a field of scholarly inquiry that explores the production and circulation of meaning and covers all forms of cultural practice. Objects of inquiry are broad and include literary texts, products of mass media, object of industrial production, consumer culture, marginality, and other aspects of everyday life.”

Down from the side of its history, cultural studies emanated during the second half of the 20th century in repercussions to the marginalization of topics thought to be somewhat trivial in the social sciences and humanities. It thought that traditional objects of study, such as classic literature, key religions, social institutions, and economic forces, should not be considers the only things that shed light on the human condition. The outcome of our popular everyday life, whether they could be television shows, fashion, music, young

people movement and lifestyle, socio cultural organization, film, social media and the gadgets, newspaper and magazines, drama and other performing arts, novel should also be considered rich texts worthy study. Could be from all that, are genuine cultural artifacts that can tell us a lot about ourselves, our culture, our convention and how it all nests within larger socioeconomic and political context that are very dynamics in the runaway globalized world.

According to Barker (2002: 2), cultural studies is constituted by multiple voices of languages that nevertheless have sufficient resemblances to form a recognizable 'family' connected by 'kinship' ties to other families. Also may to deploy a different metaphor, cultural studies is construct by a composition of currents that constitute a distinct stream of thought in the sense that, although currents may flow in this or that direction, the stream carves a characteristic pathway. In addition, it so cultural studies are best understood as the game of language that revolves around the theoretical terms developed and deployed by persons calling their work cultural studies. That is, to use Hall's more Foucauldian language, cultural studies was grasped as a discursive formation, "a cluster of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about forms of knowledge and conduct associated with a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society" (Hall, 1997: 6). Regarding to our main purposes on the aim how we will bridging the cultural studies with social capital may we be able to ask to our self-how do we talk about cultural studies, and for what purposes? We might usefully follow up this inquiry by asking some further questions, what are the constituent parts of the game of language in cultural studies? What are the purposes of cultural studies in our everyday life? Where are the practices of cultural studies formulated? What is the basic link between cultural studies and social capital? What is the relationship between cultural studies, social capital and ASEAN community in this sense?

Cultural studies in its history thick with Western traditions, especially in the United Kingdom. It is a capital and a new breath for one of the largest cultural studies that it wanted out of the mainstream. Up to now the cultural studies has developed extensive in scope, to large and in the interest of up to in Southeast Asia and South Asia. Studies of the culture in South Asia resulted in numerous publications and influential thinkers, but Southeast Asia's type and model of this study only imitate not to be developed and innovation toward local culture praxis.

If we want to reach is how this study can live within the scope of a regional organization has certainly not solely focusing on ASEAN to that organization. Nevertheless, it is more focused on how people living in the member states of ASEAN organizations. Cultural studies initially are the realm of theoretical frame, even though the domain actually originated from the findings of the authentic. However, an ongoing process through the absorption of scientific and lengthy discussions so that it becomes a popular systemic conceptual things. However, in fact cultural studies was not the actual context regardless of the study that is more of a cultural portrait of the everyday human social activity.

The character of human life in Southeast Asia is the most complex in the world. Here live many ethnic mix of the world before they form a nation state (Lockard, 2009: 5-33). Indonesia as the largest country's from the side of population and area have diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Malaysia has things similarly. Also with Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines. The difference and diversity that actually called as social capital. That it is by studying culture during this time only seen as a reality. If according to the behavior and characteristics of the cultural studies of the anti-establishment this approach must enable itself to revamp that social capital in the form of the difference became starting point to create new approaches. For example, by supporting innovation in depth research about the use of one language in the region as social glue. We have realized that the language is sometimes just a game. Thus, instead of the intended does not support a minority language should have English as a medium to communicate in Southeast Asia started to reduced and was featured in the new language of the region, alternatively for example Bahasa Malay or Bahasa Indonesia. Because of the sensitive maybe, it may referred to as Bahasa ASEAN only, as a form of social glue that is able to recognize the cultural symbols that pent-up, while still celebrating the differences that exist in it by giving the space of continuous cultural dialogue.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CAPITAL BRIDGE

Departing from the questions above we will begin to continue this discussion by discussing it first on social capital. Later after completion of describing of social capital, we will try to answer these questions.

Finding social capital in social sciences and especially sociology, we can easily found at community. In the term of community embedded inside of social bonds. That is why when we talked social capital always refers to social bonds as the basic condition.

The ability of a community or groups to collaborate and foster trust among its member or with outside parties is a powerful force for collaboration and foster confidence in the other, because that is so called "social capital." If community members work together and trust each other based on the values, universal values that exist, there would be no mutual suspicion, oppressive and so on each other so that inequalities between groups that inequalities poor with the rich will be minimized. Then, the ability of society to cooperate in order to achieve common goals in the various groups and organizations that came to called social capital is the ability to collaborate in attendance from the common belief in a society or a small part in the community. Social capital are able to institutionalize in the group of the least or in large community groups such as the state or organization between states.

In common, definitions of most social capital are focus on the social relations that have benefits and those are productive. Various definitions identified in the core results of research literature of social capital, from very specific nature of the context of social capital and the complexity of conceptualization and operationalization of social capital itself.

The further reading from various sources social capital is about the value of social networks, bonding similar people and bridging between diverse people, with norms of reciprocity (Dekker & Uslaner 2001; Uslaner, 2001). Sander (2002: 213) argued, "The folk wisdom that more people get their jobs from whom they know, rather than what they know, turns out to be true." Adler and Kwon (2002) identified that the core intuition guiding social capital research is that the goodwill that others have toward us is a valuable resource. As such, they define social capital as "the goodwill available to individuals or groups. Its source lies in the structure and content of the actor's social relations. Its effects flow from the information, influence, and solidarity it makes available to the actor" (Adler & Kwon, 2002: 23). With a more assertive note, Dekker and Uslaner (2001) posited that social capital is fundamentally about how people interact with each other.

Furthermore, if we compare it with the key thinker or the main contributors to the formation of concept and theory of social capital

may found a richer perspective in reading social capital. In his idea, Baker (1990: 619), state that social capital is “a resource that actors derive from specific social structures and then use to pursue their interests, it is created by changes in the relationship among actors.”

When traced in literature study of sociology Pierre Bourdieu (1986: 248) became one of the key thinkers on social capital. Despite of that he never stated that he is the only inventor of the idea, concept and theory of social capital. In its simplicity, he contributed basic ideas that, the aggregate of the actual or potential resources that linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition we can put it as social capital. Deeper in his idea Bourdieu (1986: 243) also mentioned that made up of social obligations “connections”, which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of a title of nobility.

The basic idea and level analysis of Bourdieu in the individual and or class faction—titles/names, friendships/associations, memberships, citizenships. Another level of analysis also develop and appears on the community or family level. Proponent thinker on this level analysis is James S. Coleman. Referring to Coleman (1990: 302) social capital (*worked*) defined by its function. It is not a single entity, but a variety of different entities having two characteristics in common. They all consist of some aspect of social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of individuals who are within the structure.

While for Putnam (1995: 67), placed at region or community as his level of analysis produce explanation on social capital is the features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. By its explanation in recent days the most activist referred that the outcome of these relations are benefits.

Until here, we have an explanation of social capital and level of analysis with each of the thinkers who support it. Each level of analysis consisted of the level of individuals, families and communities. To make our initial discussions are richer in sight of social capital, we will add other ideas and explanations out of the three levels or groups of earlier.

Social capital that exists in societal lives for Schiff (1992: 160) because it was the set of elements of the social structure that affects relations among people and are inputs or arguments of the production and or utility function. The ability of people (*in society*) to work

together for common purposes in groups and organizations by then social capital can be defined simply as the existence of a certain set of informal values or norms shared among members of a group that permit cooperation among them (Fukuyama, 1995: 10, 1997). It can worked with maximum based on information, trust, and norms of reciprocity inhering in one's social networks (Woolcock, 1998: 153).

As if to conclude Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992: 119) refer to all of this explanation as the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition.

ASEAN: CONTESTATION ON IDEALS AND REALITY

Focusing on trust will not be achieved by itself, requires a process to continuously build trust. To regenerate confidence in every community groups at least need these basic things, namely; since the beginning of the relationship of each person in the ASEAN member states entails the guarantee that they fully accepted, including a sense of security to put forward opinions and contribute to the activities. Required an atmosphere of mutual respect for the growing acceptance within the group, so that the group would grow into a strong community. In the development of the social bonds of a community, know each other well is the beginning of the growth of the community, the trust will not grow to a new person with so only, need to prove in the attitude and behavior of each in quite a long time.

Attitudes and behavior based on the universal values that are believed to be valid values in all places in the world such as honest, fair, fidelity, mutual protection among fellow all the citizens of the community. If one of the people doing the cheating, then the trust of the person is automatically going to wear off.

Everyone who is associated in one community in order to solve problems together, need information about; the life, experience, ideas, the value of each individual. The problem issues that considered important in their lives. To foster trust, the exchange of information among citizens must give information that is honest and open. The information provided will not be meaningful if the relationships had not constituted a concern. Every citizen who is associated in the

community would use to solve problems and get involved in their surroundings when there is concern among them. If citizens have the ability and willingness of sharing, mutual care, then the individual interests will yield to the interests of community groups.

Further purposes are to determine common goals. Every member not to be interested in and provide the necessary commitment if not involved in the formulation of objectives. The decision making process will determine the commitment of citizens or member in the implementation of joint problem solving. This weakness occurs in formulating action plan that became the material of ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) that been discussed here.

At an early stage in determining the objectives to be achieved by all members, ensuring there will be responsible to drive all activities to achieve the purpose, for it required one or group of leaders. Within the organization, group, or community residents, the role of attitudes and behavior of the leaders was dominant to growing confidence in its members. The behavior of leaders, who are honest, fair, caring and protecting its members, will foster the trust of all elements of the community.

After the goal was set, there should be planning to implement decisions already made. It is important to understand what the needs felt by the members to solve the problem. For that there needs to be the involvement of citizens in the process of identifying issues (needs) they will be the basis of planning. Requirements specified by the leader without involving citizens, often do not respond to problems that actually exist so that it can eliminate the trust of citizens to the good intentions of its leaders. In addition, this happens at all levels on the pillars of the ASEAN cooperation.

In a 2011 headline in the *Jakarta Post* dated 18 November, Dato' Sri Mohd Najib bin Tun Haji Abdul Razak the Prime Minister of Malaysia write an opinion entitled "*Insight: ASEAN and Global Power Shift.*" Excerpts from its opinion is written like this, "now, in late 2011, we are close to securing the most crucial stage yet of our regional relationship—the ASEAN Community. It is not about trying to create some tropical facsimile of the European Union. We are not thinking about a single currency or open borders or a central bank. Instead, we are forming a more consolidated ASEAN, a stronger union based on three pillars—mutual security, an integrated economy and sociocultural ties."

To name just a few and is considering to build that has been built up over many years in the field of political and security

cooperation, ASEAN leaders agreed to establish the APSC (ASEAN Political-Security Community). APSC aims to ensure that countries in the region live at peace with one another with a fairly democratic and harmonious. Members in this community promises to rely only on the peace process in the resolution of inter-regional differences and regard their security as fundamentally linked to one another and bound by geographic location, common vision and purpose.

AEC (ASEAN Economic Community) areas of cooperation include human resource development and capacity building, recognition of professional qualifications, consultation on macroeconomic and financial policies, trade financing measures, improved infrastructure and communications connectivity, development of electronic transactions through e-ASEAN. Integrating industries across the region to promote the source area, and increase the involvement of the private sector to build the AEC. In short, the AEC will turn ASEAN into a region with free movement of goods, services, investment, skilled labor, and the free flow of capital.

ASCC (ASEAN Sosio-Cultural Community) have a purpose in manifesting ASEAN community-oriented people and social responsibility with a view to achieve solidarity and unity among the people and the member states of ASEAN. Trying to forge a common identity and build a society that caring and sharing are inclusive and where well-being, livelihoods and well-being of the people improved. ASCC focused on the maintenance of human resources, culture and nature for sustainable development in ASEAN harmonized and people-oriented.

Discussing how to revamp the ASEAN as a state oriented (organization) to people oriented action, we deserve focus on existing community in the sphere of ASEAN because they often overlooked in almost all activities of the organization. Although the of age this organization more than 40 years, but in fact we still often hear questions is that ASEAN as an organization actually exist at community level? Therefore, we have to realize the fact that ASEAN unpopular among societies.

We also necessitate realizing together that there is an entity that is important for ASEAN was not simply discussed regional organization among nations, but rather to the fine points that are relevant in the lives of social and cultural interaction. Which both is relevance of it binds social action wherever people are, as has been revealed by O'Leary (2007), Harrison and Huntington (2000) and

Hall (1997). The facts are serious and important for us to discuss how to brush up on ASEAN so popular among the people especially to younger generation for example. This is vital because they are the young who will be the successor and heir to the ASEAN. The more so if the higher social mobility and the ASEAN community is actually running. The more so if the higher social mobility and the ASEAN community is actually running. Then the organization should begin to approach people oriented. In this stage the role of governments, business groups, ngo's, and society, intellectual from university must participate seriously.

When viewed from point of view of security, ASEAN is still in the form of community and nature in the early stages. The history of conflict as well as various cultures and societies in Southeast Asia even since before formation of the country, have caused motion acceleration of ASEAN cooperation is very slow. Conflict with different nature also led to the principle of non-interference is very fundamental in ASEAN. However, as it or not this principle also leads to ASEAN is still there and not lost as compared to what is happening in the Gulf countries for example.

However it seems to date it seems socialization on various principles of ASEAN included the development of a sense of "*kekitaan*" is still limited among diplomats, bureaucrats and mere international observers, not to go into the realm of public or community. Herein lies the challenge for ASEAN is currently and will come, that change base cooperation from state oriented to people oriented.

Most observers contend that ASEAN has not fully become "full fledge security community." Recent developments, however, the existence of ASEAN identity along with the rising and the role of ASEAN in regional conflicts that do not muffle can be removed pointed out that ASEAN is already showing signs of the success of the security community at a limited rate. A lot of attention in spite of the analysts regarding the security community is a matter of political instability that can lead to the occurrence of violence on a large scale in a country. Scientists and observers generally more focused on peaceful relations between states, while violence or conflict that occurs within a country tends to ignored.

Forgetting the existence of domestic violence because of the security community led to the society and the state to be equally insecure. Violence within a country can also cause the departure of persons and displaced as well as other violence in the region gave rise

to cross border, and in the end can stimulate the onset of conflict with neighboring countries. Seen from domestic security criteria are not only focused on security of a country but also security of its citizens from violence, whether committed by states or by non-state actors, then the claim that ASEAN is already approaching the realization of pluralistic security community will still need to fight until the times of the future.

In fact, in the ASEAN environment, there are different problems, and if the visits are available mechanisms to solve it, we already have a treaty of amity in cooperation. If we look at recommendations, which the treaty may grant found not to be use in solving the bilateral territorial dispute. It means we still need intermediary institutions in their own right. At the other hand, if we keep relying on a treaty, keep in mind that there are currently 12 others associated with the deal it so it is not only a treaty applies for ASEAN member countries only.

Modalities and practices during this run ASEAN will not actually singed with the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC). It is precisely the old principles of ASEAN to be a major feature of the APSC, as respects the sovereignty of states, non-interference, consensus, and projected the conflict peacefully. Although the concept, strategy and program of work in the area of the APSC's comprehensive and detailed, the question that arises is how to implement all of it, how to actualized its stages and when the scheduled time for each stage in order to run smoothly. The differences in socio political system, which is still wide, gap between the ASEAN countries. Strategies oriented to domestic, tend to accentuate aspects of civic, and demanded the opening of the political system and the communication in any member state against the participation of outside for a while will surely experience many obstacles.

In the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), if we look for real yet there is something to integrated. We have built a free trade area plus, but did not set up a central authority to determine our economic policies or to conduct negotiations with outside parties. On the economic side, we also need to organize the vision and purpose of the importance of free trade area.

A key component of the AEC in the field of trade is the freedom of chattels that can achieved by accelerating the ease of trading. From here, the transaction fees and the cost of doing business in ASEAN can decline. Therefore, the agreement of the Ministers of the ASEAN economies to better focus on ease-of-trade and appointing senior

officials to develop programs to ease trade as a whole can be seen as a good step.

Some important progress in ASEAN cooperation in the sectors of customs, transport and communication can create momentum for a comprehensive program. Developments in the ASEAN single window and run of ratification the ASEAN framework agreement on multimodal transport shows positive indications. If such initiatives are executed completely, then it is not just helping the expansion of inter trade members, but will also enhance the attractiveness of ASEAN as an investment destination.

In field of trade in services, the negotiations go on under the umbrella of ASEAN Framework Agreement on Services (AFAS). ASEAN members agreed to integrate the service sector and encourage all relevant officials and sectorial agencies working together to achieve ultimate goal of the ASEAN economic community, namely trade in services could be free to move. Similarly in the investment sector that need to be opened even further in addition to the promotional efforts still continue and simplify the process of investment under the umbrella of ASEAN Investment Area (AIA). To make the ASEAN as a single production as intended in the ASEAN Economic Community concept, then open up investment to ASEAN members for sesame and foreign investment from outside ASEAN to do together. During this implementation, open investment sectors were left to the member states of each of the AIA does not show progress means.

It is important to ensure the working programs that compiled with phasing short, medium and long, is the development of ASEAN institutions. Without adequate institutions, especially the agencies that serve oversees, evaluates, and when you need to force ASEAN members following the agreements and commitments on schedule has been set, then the process of economic integration of ASEAN will be a failure.

In line with efforts to deepen and widen economic integration, the existence of a mechanism for effective problem resolution is absolutely necessary. The experience of ASEAN in resolving issue of trade between its members could be a lesson and motivation to create a more powerful mechanism and generate a valid and binding decision.

However, executed a program of economic integration in accordance with the blueprint will also not guarantee the creation of the ASEAN Economic Community if the ASEAN organization remains

the arena meeting government officials without the participation of economic actors. Even the chasm wide communication between ASEAN and the ASEAN community widely perceived evenly distribute in all areas, not just economics. The involvement of economic actors both in the process of formulation of the program, decision-making and implementation of the program is an absolute requirement in the process of economic integration.

Already be a lesson that as long as this agreement is only binding commitment of ASEAN Heads of Government and the Ministers concerned took home the decisions agreed upon and to market it in their respective countries. It always gets no positive economic actors, because they do not know a matter of ASEAN's economic program. Exclusive pattern such as this cannot be sustained any longer in order to build a community. Therefore, ASEAN must innovate itself and involving all parties.

Compared with the other two pillars, the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) harder conceptualized about what we want to get up unless to improve human security and community engagement in the regions. However, if we want to do something for humanity then takes a wide variety of resources. ASEAN still lacks substantial resources to do more to enhance human resources. Nevertheless, we still look forward to these ASCC can be brought together and tried to encourage them to identify themselves with ASEAN.

The ASEAN Charter begins with the words; *we the ASEAN region, as represented by heads of State and head of Government of Member States*. At least symbolically, this is an attempt to put community ahead of the government, and indeed, we hope that we can apply mindset to put people at the front.

Socio cultural community plan of action is including the most slowly in its progress. In addition, to its too general, less specific, indefinitely, as well as less focus. Partly due to the institutional issues, a group of senior economic official form ASEAN economic forum, negotiating and then brought to the forum of ASEAN economic ministers. At the same time ASEAN senior official meeting sponsored by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs establishes a forum discussing a wide range of topic related to ASEAN community ranging from education to illegal medicines, health, labor and the environment. Officials attended the meeting from a variety of different departments so that less control problems.

Furthermore, we believe that a community should contain the actual dimensions of the moral attitudes of humanity based on its strength in personal interests and realize the synergy of their differences, as well as overcoming the divisions and conflicts between elements of the community in question.

Thus, we believe that quality of process of community development in Southeast Asia is not only dependent on the scope and depth of the cooperation efforts between the State and Government at the regional, but also on moral purpose that directs and maintains these processes. Moral purposes must be a power that unites, overcoming geographical barriers, cultural differences, economic disparity, and the difference of social and political ideology. It should be able to overcome the asymmetry in the region, among the powerful and the weak, the large and small, rich and poor, who benefited and who is harmed. It had to embody all the most essential purpose where each member of the community can be asserted and attempt to fulfill them.

The formation of regional identity and mutual understanding is a long-term struggle with regard to the education of children and young people, as well as the public, the transformation of life as well as eliminate the attitude mutual suspicion and blamed each other. An effort to increase public engagement and relevance of ASEAN for the community is not easy. We need real representation of the steps in the realization of regional identity among other with innovation models and approaches in hanging out based on social wealth as the main capital.

In this context, it was time for ASEAN to consider the paradigm change and decision-making mechanism of the state leading the society paradigm. In which the state directs people to conform to the political attitudes and behavior, a foreign society leading the state, where the public can play a role for the member's direction for the preparation and implementation of foreign politics so that the role and the level of community involvement will be larger and significant. This will encourage the creation of a more participatory decision-making mechanism so that the relevance of ASEAN mean for people's lives. In order to guarantee peace and stability. ASEAN needs to bring together community and enhanced their consciousness as one of the ASEAN family groups, although this is certainly not easy.

ASEAN could not forget interconnections among the three pillars (economic and social security, culture) which became a major foundation of the ASEAN community. Core elements of each

society must not collide with each other, and all must be formulated in accordance with the reality of the global environment that exists now. Strategy and work program in the field of comprehensive security community needs to support by the implementation in the field by creating human security in ASEAN countries. To that end, the necessary fundamental attitude of the government has an obligation to play the role of prosperities and its community through improved human security, in addition to safeguarding the sovereignty of the country.

Thus, comprehensive security is a necessary condition in order to realize the goal of a nation state, which is the realization of a society that is unprotected and prosperous. Nevertheless, it is worth being think is how to manage people's lives not only of the national security aspects alone but had started to increase to the management of public security in the regional landscape.

ASEAN economic community is how to build the required commitment is not only binding on the head of government and the ministers concerned, but should also include economic actors in particular and society in general in the process of economic integration. Institutional support in the form of an appropriate regional units function urgently needed to ensure the passage of an economic program on the schedule that has been agreed upon works. It is important to remember also that this need not lead to "obesity" of the ASEAN bureaucracy.

As far as this topic placed in the community program concerning the social culture is democracy, human rights, and gender. There have been many programs for young people, but more important is the follow-up of the program. The government should be the main facilitator in order to foster awareness of the public to participate in building of ASEAN community.

Talking about the government readiness of ASEAN countries, we must look at the differences between them and their respective governments are more interested in a particular field. For example, the Philippines are more attracted to social-culture pillars, Indonesia on the security pillar, and Singapore in the economic pillar, appropriate priorities and interests of each country.

In general when viewed one by one, especially in the political-security community pillar Indonesia still need a clearer vision of what they want to accomplish. Furthermore, Indonesia for example, speaks

of the need to raise the issue of political security to a higher level. To build a sense of mutual trust, we need to go a step further from the stage of building trust to solving our common will.

ON A REFLEXIVE CONCLUSION

A critical note on the measurement of social capital. We ask some fundamental questions about the measurement of social capital that is the bottom line shows that the study of social capital has a problem in terms of determination of the standard. The questions that arise such as how to measure the trust in a society or how to weigh the difference trust among different groups. How to measure the role of group members in a group and how to calculate the difference in the role of the individual within the Group? How to measure the norms and values in society? Just like what Narayan & Cassidy (2001) presented.

On the conceptual level, social capital, tend to ignore the social construction factors about the choice of the individual or individual motivation, so the trust or credibility as one aspect of the social capital could not be generalized to provide benefits for the sustainability of the ASEAN community as a whole. Each member would essentially fight for their interests, so very likely happen precisely the abuse of trust and conflict of interest. It is of course precisely caused negative impact on economic and social system. In addition, the concept of social capital overlook the inequalities in terms of access to and control over resources, so that we cannot assume that each individual as a member of the same group of gain from membership in a group. Social capital approach also missed in looking at the negative effects of certain norms of a particular group. Acceptance of the norms or the observance of certain values is does not always create an advantage in society. In the context of certain societies, cultural values often precisely create inequities among its members in the access and resources, examples are the values that drive gender inequalities where the occurrence of subordinate the role of women in the marginal position. The measurement of social capital ignores the existence of inequality in trust and trustworthiness, inequality among groups as well as among the members of the group, and differences in the norms followed in society or the inequality tension norm in society.

How far the trust of others provide advantages for each individual Member of ASEAN, so trust it here decidedly more contextual and cannot be generalized to such an extent as functionalistic views. That is, a growing belief in society is the mutually beneficial nature of mutualism or among individuals that build trust.

Membership in a particular social group cannot provide the same or equivalent profits among its members. In fact, it refers to the views of these inequalities, functionalist theories are necessary because it has a function of the passage of the mechanisms of the organization. View Weber's rationality also saw a division of roles is not equivalent in the bureaucracy on the level of organization in ASEAN. Take the example of a slightly different, individual membership in an organization such as a company, employees of the company, according to the view of Marxism become a harmful exploitative partnership-operating core yet they do not even realize it because of false consciousness. In the context of Marxism view, which is a benefit only certain specially procured by the financier?

We argue that the measurement of social capital does not have a standard that can be given the raw variable is measured, such as social networking, trust, value, membership, and so on. By their very nature, where the community is made up of social static and social dynamics as proposed by Comte, social aspects of culture is always evolving and dynamic to follow the dynamics of the society. Therefore, we do not agree if social capital is measured according to the concepts that are too economics that with variable terms remain unchanged or social. The mainstream approach looks material in their approach to social capital, and social variables is very dynamic. Thus, it is necessary the presence of another against local or public variable specified when making the measurement of social capital.

Having regard to the exposure that exists, it may be time to put forward that the language because of the development and innovation of a superficial study of the culture included as social capital to engage in building ASEAN community. With our language will be able to understand the spaces and the difference in value cannot be measured by capital. The idea of making Bahasa Indonesia or Bahasa Melayu as an official language of ASEAN is an incredible idea. That idea would be a window for entering into a long-term investment of planting became the Southeast Asian. Language became a unifying and glue the cultural and social capital needs to be promoted its role.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P.S., & Kwon, S.W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *The Academy of Management Review* 27, 17-40.
- Baker, W. (1990). Market networks and corporate behaviour. *American Journal of Sociology* 96, 589-625.
- Barker, C. (2002). *Making sense of cultural studies*. London: Sage.
- Bennett, A. (2005). *Culture and everyday life*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, Loïc J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Coleman, J.S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dekker, P., & Uslaner, E. M., eds. (2001). *Social capital and participation in everyday life*. London: Routledge.
- During, S. (2005). *Cultural studies: A critical introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Fukuyama, F. (1997). Social capital and the modern capitalist economy: Creating a high trust workplace. *Stern Business Magazine* 4.
- Griswold, W. (2003). *Culture and societies in a Changing World*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Hall, S., ed. (1997). *Representation*. London: Sage.
- Harrison, L.E. & Huntington, S.P., eds. (2000). *Culture matters: How values shape human progress*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lockard, Craig. (2009). *Southeast Asia in World History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Narayan, D. & Cassidy, M.F. (2001). A dimensional approach to measuring Social Capital: Development and Validation of a social capital Inventory. *Current Sociology* 49, 59-102.
- Narayan, D. & Pritchett, L. (1999). Social capital: Evidence and implications. In I. Serageldin (Ed.), *Social capital: A multifaceted perspective*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Narayan, D. (2002). Bonds and bridges: Social capital and poverty. In S. Ramaswamy (Ed.), *Social capital and economic development*:

- Well-being in Developing Countries*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- O'Leary, Z. (2007). *The social science jargon buster: The key terms you need to know*. London: Sage.
- Putnam, R.D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6, 65-78.
- Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E., & McDaniel, E.R. (2010). *Communication between culture*. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Sander, T. H. (2002). Social capital and new urbanism: Leading a civic horse to water. *National Civic Review* 91, 213-221.
- Sardar, Z. (2005). *Introducing cultural studies*. New York: Totem Books.
- Schiff, M. (1992). Social capital, labour mobility and welfare: The impact of Uniting States. *Rationality and Society* 4.
- Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Towards a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society* 27, 151-208.