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Introduction

Civil society has been increasingly conceived of in the global, as it manages to transcend the boundary of the nation state, creating cross-border communication with local participation (Kaldor 2003). Indeed, it has been argued “the rule of thumb, both in the past and present, is that the liveliest local civil societies are those enjoying the strongest links with the global civil society” (Keane 2001:27). Yet global civil society is not by any means universal; civil societies can be weak, localised or isolated, whilst the relationship between national and international forces can demonstrate uneven relationships of power (Keane 2001:38). Whilst international networks and influence can bring money, resources and solidarity they can also raise issues of legitimacy (Majot 2012). In this context, Thailand’s civil society is particularly interesting. Although often described as limited, Thailand has seen numerous (sometimes successful) mobilisations of citizens and has a recorded 65,000 NGOs (The Resource Alliance 2013). The mass protests of late 2013 demonstrate the possibility of mobilisation, although they do not necessarily support a positive view about the long-term prospects of civil society. In apparent support of democratisation, international organisations, such as USAID, have current projects in place to support and strengthen Thai civil society, and both international funders and international civil society networks are present to some degree (DAI 2013). This study aims to explore the interaction between Thai civil society and international actors, and assess the way this impacts the strength of Thai civil society.

Understanding civil society

Civil society has been used in a number of different ways, and varying assumptions inherent in its usage shape the conclusions about it (Kaldor 2003). It is for this reason that some have shied away from the framework in relation to Thailand and elsewhere; Baker, for example, disregards a civil society framework in relation to analysing Thailand’s Assembly of the Poor, calling it a “slippery term”, but not elucidating his critique any further (2000:6). Whilst it is still being used by international organisations, governments and development agencies it remains relevant and an analytical use is possible if the different meanings ascribed to it by different actors are recognised.

This study will consider civil society broadly as a bottom-up communicative sphere, outside of political institutions. Civil society includes both formal and informal organisations and associations and its objectives are varied, including political and legal rights as well as social and economic rights (Glasius 2005). A strong civil society enables participation of citizens and the representation of different people and ideas in a public sphere. It ultimately is based on the idea that for democracy, state power has “to be monitored, engaged with and rendered accountable, through intentional and engaged citizen action” (Chandhoke 2007:608). It is this notion of civil society used by opposition activists in the 1980s that sparked the revival of civil society language. Opposition activists in Eastern Europe turned to civil society projects to challenge the state, “through strikes, protest marches, demonstrations, dissemination of information through informal networks, and the formation of associational life through the setting up of reading clubs and discussion forums” (Chandhoke 2007:607). Although the regimes that replaced the authoritarian states may not have ensured the public sphere, that civil society activists were aiming for, the power of civil society to create change is clearly evident in the toppling of authoritarian governments. Whilst the term civil society is often used differently, it is in this sense that a strong civil society can be seen as
beneficial for democracy, and it is this sense that the reality of civil society in Thailand shall be analysed against.

NGOs may be part of civil society, and indeed there has been some merging of the roles of NGOs and civil society, but there are distinctions. NGOs may include activism, but may also take on service provision roles. In doing so, they may actually take on a passive role and be co-opted by the state. In comparison, strong civil societies work to hold the state accountable, and provide a way for citizens to interact with it. Whilst the Occupy movements were probably one of the most noticeable recent attempts at building a new civil society, civil societies are evident globally.

There are notable questions that are raised when analysing civil society and the influence of the international on the local, for example legitimacy and accountability. Whilst civil society activists rely on idealistic notions of democracy, concerns can be raised about the influence they are trying to seek. In countries such as Thailand that have some democratic process it is sometimes questioned, often by those in the political institutions, how much legitimacy civil society has in regards to elected officials. Civil society, however can claim legitimacy through adding new voices or in demanding legal accountability- sitting clearly on the constituent side, rather than in comparison to elected officials (Peruzzotti 2012:48). The global dimension complicates this argument further, as the legitimacy of organisations to act in countries and places, to which they are not part of the constituency, is further debatable. Cultural and social contexts can vary, and those that wish to do good may end up doing more harm. Whilst Majot (2012) argues that international advocacy efforts can be beneficial and legitimate players in supporting local advocacy, this is importantly an issue that varies from case to case. To assess this in the Thai case, this study will consider the impact of Thai civil society with international actors, by first considering the processes of interaction and then the problems inherent within it.

Methodology

In considering civil society in Thailand, this study looks broadly at different aspects of Thai civil society and how they have been affected by interaction with international actors. By international actors, this study includes global civil society networks, funders and international organisations. The evidence it uses is varied and includes interviews the author conducted and time she spent with different civil society groups during September to October 2013 (see Appendix I). It is limited however to groups, which operate predominantly outside the conflict-area of the South of Thailand, in recognition of the very different dynamics of civil society in that region and the complexities of research there. Even with this limitation, it would be impossible to assess all of Thai civil society. However the field work has been supplemented with existing literature and this study is a good representation of the existing systems. The groups looked at have been chosen for covering the variation of issues and organisations (see Appendix II). In particular, two main divisions in activist based civil society were noted surrounding the issues the groups represent: 1) governance issues, 2) minority-rights based issues, including gender, sexual orientation and indigenous rights. Aside from analysing these groups, this research has also benefited from the input of others involved in the sphere of civil society, from academics to those involved with funding of civil society and those involved with development. It should be noted however, that this study aims not to be a comprehensive overview of Thai civil society, but an exploration of the interaction between local civil society and international actors in the Thai context, which has been
possible to document within the limited scope of this study. To do this, this paper will briefly consider the context of civil society in Thailand, before looking at the processes of interaction between Thai civil society and international actors, and the areas of complications, before finally providing some conclusions and suggestions for how civil society can be strengthened.
I. Civil Society in Thailand

Civil society in Thailand manifests itself in a number of different ways, supporting different projects and organisations. With various funders working in Thailand and civil society an issue for democratisation efforts, there have been past assessments of Thai civil society, often providing different conclusions. This section provides an overview of the context of Thai civil society, in order to assess how the relationship with international actors may shape it.

There are several different aspects to civil society in Thailand. Various supporters of civil society in Thailand, from the Asian Development Bank to Kepa, have found different ways of describing these. Firstly there exists a large network of NGOs that are often considered as civil society, many of these act as service providers, where government provision is lacking. In a report on the Thailand NGO Awards, it was listed that over 65,000 NGOs operate in Thailand (The Resource Alliance 2013). Many of these though do not engage in activism. Many of these are state-sponsored providing practical assistance only, rather than engaging in meaningful dialogue of change or development. Jukic, of DAI, whose project Sapan aims to support Thai civil society, goes as far to describe these NGOs as having a “dinosaur approach” (Jukic, Interview, 2013; Appendix I).

Yet, aside from these groups, there are many groups for whom activism is important. Firstly, there are groups aimed at improving governance. Organisations who work solely on improving democratic processes are more limited, though they do exist, for example the Café Democracy (Creating Awareness for Enhanced Democracy) Project of Book Re:Public, based in Chiang Mai (Appendix I). Although the recent protests fall more towards this category, the lack of organisation makes it difficult to consider them civil society groups per se. Yet, whilst the work of governance civil society groups may be limited, there are other groups that include a governance agenda alongside areas of specific interest, such as environmentalism. In Thailand, as in other countries globally, it is often disenfranchised groups and the poor, who “lose out” with environmental problems and face exclusion from the political processes and decisions made in the city. It is these groups that organise, for example against dam-building projects or new highways; whilst the aims may seem environmental, part of their activity is focused on the lack of access to politics that the citizens they represent have. Often representing the rural poor, they have been described as watermelon activists, green on the outside and red on the inside (Fahn 2003). The Assembly of the Poor, who managed to mobilise a sustained 99-day protest in Bangkok in 1997 would also be included in this category (Baker 2000). As well as the fact that these two types of group target different communities, they also differ in their organisation, with the environmental-governance groups more of a loose network of activists rather than an organisation with specific resources and long-term goals. Both Jukic and Promphakping of Khon Kaen University (Interview 2013; Appendix I) have highlighted the limited long-term organisational capacity of these groups. Café Republic in contrast aims to engage the middle-classes, sees their work as continual, and look to international donors such as USAID (Laungaramsri, Interview 2013; Appendix I).

Another quite different form of civil society is seen in the minority-based rights activist groups. The groups working on issues of gender (such as Friends of Women) and sexual orientation and identity (for example Anjaree) tend to operate from a city–base and look to outside funds for their work. Groups such as these are numerous, with Friends of
Women and Anjaree providing two different ends to the spectrum: Friends of Women is a long-established group with offices around Thailand, receiving funds from USAID and the EU amongst others, whereas Anjaree is a small organisation, looking to expand. They receive some international funds from the American Jewish Service, but this is not yet enough to afford even one office to work from. These groups, and other similar groups use a number of different tactics and actions in their work, involving outreach, work on legislation and campaigning as well as some elements of practical support for the groups concerned.

Although their work has similarities, the indigenous rights groups in Thailand demonstrate more organised characteristics. This is probably the group that gets the most support from outside relative to their size, and is also in many cases an older form of civil society. Whilst the circumstances facing indigenous groups and refugees may be harder, their civil society is more sophisticated and organised (Jukic, Interview 2013; Promphakping, Interview 2013).

Opinions of Thai civil society vary and are incredibly relative. The Asian Development Bank states, rather optimistically that “Thai civil society is now varied and diverse, and coexists with strong constitutional guarantees of direct political participation, freedom of assembly, requirements for government consultation, and local determination of community rights” (2011:2). Indeed, Thailand is sometimes seen as a model for the region, and a 2012 educational trip run by a non-profit education organisation saw Myanmar and Japanese students visit Thailand to learn about civil society (Learning Across Borders 2012). International funders of Thai civil society are leaving the country, as Thailand is becoming wealthier and the political situation continues to be stable. Those that are staying tend to support projects focused on disadvantaged groups, such as indigenous groups (Kepa 2012). Yet, Jukic of DAI, whose project Sapan is meant to be working on civil society, highlights the problems and weakness of Thai civil society, arguing it hasn’t got the organisational capacity and knowledge of civil society elsewhere - in particular he contrasts Bangkok based civil society to the refugee groups operating from the North of Thailand (Interview 2013). He argues there is lack of exposure to global civil society and that the language barrier and nationalistic concerns about working with international groups prevents civil society in Thailand from benefiting from international networks and resources. Indeed, international advocacy networks are not obviously apparent in Thailand, and whilst there are some groups who work with international advocacy groups, such as MAP who worked with No Sweat and indigenous groups such as IMPECT who work with IWGIA amongst others, they remain the exceptions rather than the rule.

Yet, it would be wrong to deride civil society as something alien to Thai culture. Notions of participation can be seen in traditional rural culture, as Ockey demonstrates (2005). Mobilisations, such as the Assembly of the Poor, have been incredibly visible in the past. However, mass mobilisations have turned violent, with for example the red-shirt protests of 2010, demonstrating some of the internal problems Thai civil society might face: state repression and also a history of violence in state-society relations. The civil society activists I met had varying views about the state of Thai civil society though a few opinions were commonly held, the first being issues of funding, and the second, uncertainty in the political landscape, with a couple citing a possibility of state-society violence. Most however, were optimistic about the gains made since the 1970s.
It is in this environment, of a lack of resources, of a fear of the political landscape, that civil society in Thailand, in its various forms, operates. Understanding this is important to understanding the impact of international support, both in the field of funding and the provision of physical resources and also in the field of network activism.
II. Processes of Interaction

The processes in which international donors interact with Thai civil society vary between organisations. There are two main ways for international and local civil society to interact, the first being the provision of funds and physical resources to local civil society groups. This is the interaction that was most common amongst the civil society groups interviewed in Thailand. However, internationally network activism also plays a role in supporting local civil society groups. This tends to involve the sharing of information, the creation of international networks and often the use of social media channels to promote local causes elsewhere. The fact this process of interaction is lacking in Thailand suggests some of the problems that Thai civil society faces.

Funding

Funding processes and any challenges stemming from it varied again between groups. Many of the civil society activists talked to cited problems in trying to attain funds, and whilst this was a problem particularly for smaller groups such as Anjaree and Book Re:public, the decreasing amount of international funds available was also cited by the executive director of Raks Thai (Pantichpakdi, Interview 2013):

“There is a problem in Thailand with funding generally; funders are pulling out every year. It’s a big problem. And funders have the power to say ‘no I wont work with you’, or ‘you have to cut your budget again’. We keep getting the demands of donors. I think this is an issue globally”

Pantichpakdi’s comments suggested that not only was there a problem in the availability of funds, but it raised issues about the relationship between funders and civil society groups. The nature and dynamics of this relation was very varied between instances as well, with some groups citing good relationships with funders that allowed for great flexibility. For example the LGBT rights group Anjaree, who received funding from the International Jewish Service, claimed that they were allowed to change how the money was spent as circumstances changed (Suvarnananda, Interview 2013). Whilst IWNT’s (Indigenous Women’s Network of Thailand) donor, Mama Cash, a Dutch feminist funding group, cites adaptability as one of their core values (Mama Cash 2013).

Most Thai civil society groups emphasised how their projects were their own, rather than products of their funders. For example, Friends of Women stressed how they went to the EU and USAID wanting to expand the areas they worked in, but with a strategy laid out. The actual projects themselves were developed in conjunction with the regional communities. This account differed in part to Sapan’s account, who suggested DAI could take some responsibility for Friends of Women’s decision to expand (Jukic, Interview 2013; Thajeen, Interview 2013).

Donors appeared to influence the work of civil society groups in several ways. Firstly, they influenced the way groups operated, encouraging at times more formal organisation; this has appeared to be the case with USAID and Book Re:public, and also with the indigenous people’s groups. Jukic of Sapan meanwhile said that in supporting a Centre for Civil Society Management at Khon Kaen University, he hoped to leave a legacy of professionalization for civil society (Jukic, Interview 2013). Secondly, donors at times

---

1 Please see Appendix I, in regards to all the examples used in this chapter.
appeared to influence the work that was carried out. For example, according to Jukic, it was DAI and USAID’s support that ensured the work by Friends of Women on the women’s fund (Interview 2013). And Raks Thai admitted that the future projects they will support will depend on what areas they can get funding for. The insistence that projects were their own by civil society groups could also be put down to the strong nationalism that was evident as well as general issues of promotion of the civil society groups. By stressing projects were their own, groups can claim legitimacy. The influence of international donors was something that was a concern and often seen quite negatively Jukic said he had seen nationalism manifest itself in distrust of foreign organisations aimed both at American and European groups. This he argued had created a reluctance to work with international groups (Interview 2013).

In addition, some groups cited that the organisation and bureaucracy of international funders as a problem when it came to creating a working relationship. Those at Book Republic cited the bureaucracy of USAID as something they found hard to deal with (Laungaramsri, Interview 2013). Whilst DAI act as a mediator between Book Republic and USAID, the founders still found the organization hard to work with and claimed both sides had to learn a lot in this collaboration. However, despite any difficulties, Book Republic continued to receive funds and training.

However, despite any issues surrounding nationalism and the strings international funders had, most groups when looking for funds, looked internationally rather than domestically. This is predominantly because the domestic opportunities are not there, the only exception being the Health Fund² (Pantichpakdi, Interview 2013). Overall the strongest relationship between donors and civil society groups were seen amongst the older groups, particularly amongst indigenous rights groups in the North of Thailand, although also with Friends of Women. This would suggest increased interaction serves for a better relationship.

Network Activism

In contrast to the search for international funds, many groups did not see the same benefit of working in international networks. Where network activism did exist it was limited, and often restricted to bordering countries. Whilst many of the more informal organisations would not be expected to seek international funding, the lack of international connections generally provides a contrast between Thai civil society and civil society elsewhere.

FTA Watch for example, are a collection of civil society groups that collaborate on the issue of free trade agreements, trying to raise attention amongst the population and work on policy advocacy. Similar groups internationally have had more international connections, and often use this to raise the pressure in their own countries, for example through the boomerang effect. Problems surrounding free trade agreements have been an issue that has raised international solidarity. Yet in Thailand apart from the example of people living with HIV in the Pacific sending a letter of support for the FTA Watch to the EU delegation, international connections are less sought after. Narintarakul of ²The Thai Health Fund takes money from the taxes on alcohol and cigarette sales and distributes it amongst projects covering issues from HIV/AIDS to healthy cities and mental health. The Fund is meant to be independent, although many interviewers cited the politics behind the appointments to the body as a problem. (Jukic, Interview 2013; Suvarnananda, Interview 2013).
BioThai, for example, did not see benefits of the involvement of international civil society groups or the media for FTA Watch. Whilst at the FTA Watch there was a banner stating ‘Occupy Seeds’, none of the participants viewed this connection to Occupy.

It would be wrong to say there was no network activism, however. There was some practical collaboration on cross-border issues, for example Friends of Women worked with groups in Myanmar, Cambodia and other South East Asian countries on the issue of human trafficking. Raks Thai cited greater collaboration with South East Asian countries, rather than their international Care partners. Anjaree had connections with LGBT groups both regionally and internationally, though they did admit their position was fairly unique. Suvarnananda, admits she has experience of working abroad, in contrast to many other Thai civil society activists (Interview 2013).

The indigenous and migrant groups in the North did play a greater role in international networks. IWNT sent delegates to the indigenous women’s conference in Peru, and MAP (a group organising for migrant workers’ rights) had some past connections to No Sweat, a UK based campaigning organisation. Promphakping of Khon Kaen University states that this is because “in that area, civil society is less statist. The boundary is not at the nation state. But in Thailand there are many NGOs promoting nationalism” (Interview 2013).

The lack of network activism has meant that Thai civil society has been more isolated and is one of the reasons civil society groups may struggle to get funds and work with funders. It can also be cited as one of the reasons civil society professionalism and organisation is seen as lacking, as it prevents a sharing of information, practises and online resources. Whilst this lack of network activism should be seen in the context of Thai nationalism, it should not be seen as entirely fixed in Thai civil society.
III. Challenges

To understand the limitations that Thai civil society faces in its interactions with international civil society and donors, the broader context must be looked at. Aside, from the problems on the international side (i.e. a lack of funds) two main challenges prevent greater international connections for Thai civil society. These are firstly, the problem of nationalism and identity, and secondly the Thai political landscape. Both of these challenges were mentioned in many of the interviews undertaken for this study.

Nationalism and identity

Thai nationalism and also a language barrier were evident as a barrier to further interaction with international civil society. Nationalism as an issue was raised by Jukic in his attempts to work with civil society groups in Thailand, as he argued it produced a deep distrust of foreigners (who are generally referred to as farangs in Thailand).

Promphakping of Khon Kaen also admitted the problems he faced in deciding how much to work with USAID, who helped fund the Centre for Civil Society Management at Khon Kaen University:

“At the beginning, there was a lot of debate about whether to work with DAI and USAID. And because a lot of people thought they might have a hidden agenda, or being working to promote the interests of the United States, we had a number of rounds of debate. And because the language, the ideology, the things that were put in here are about democracy and local governance, their interests seemed in there. But our interests were in that as well. But they seemed to have their own plan, and were not consistent with our ideas, and they had to finish their programme [in 2015]. So we thought we should think of something in the long-term, so we came up with the idea of the centre and they agreed” (Interview 2013).

This example shows some of the problems faced by Thai civil society actors when the issue of international links are raised. Whilst many of the Thai civil society actors who were not particularly concerned about international links, claimed that it was because Thailand was so unique that Thai civil society had little to gain from interacting with international groups.

In conjunction with nationalism, the language barrier also acts to prevent further civil society interaction. This is particularly the case with smaller grass-roots civil society groups who may not have the education to have members with the level of English needed to work with international actors. This was an issue that the indigenous rights groups had to come to terms with, and some such as IWNT were encouraging their staff (predominantly indigenous women themselves) to learn English. The indigenous rights groups also faced the difficulties caused by the existence of local indigenous languages. However, the ability of indigenous rights groups to work with international partners, suggests that the language barrier can be bridged by a willingness to interact. Although it cannot be denied that language, as well as nationalism, is a problem for Thai civil society’s attempts to act on the international stage.

The subsequent lack of interaction could be said to be the cause of an overall weak civil society in Thailand, as it has had less exposure to new and international civil society practises. This, however, relies on the assumption between the link between strong civil

3 Please see Appendix I in regards to all examples used in this chapter.
societies and civil societies with strong international connections that Keane (2001) mentions.

Political landscape

All civil society activists that were talked to cited, to varying degrees, that the political landscape was limiting. This manifested itself in numerous ways from the legal restrictions placed on civil society to also the state co-option of civil society and attitudes generally towards civil society.

Legally there are a number of issues that affect the ability of civil society groups to organise. Firstly, registration laws place restrictions on groups, although groups such as Anjaree are choosing to go down the path of registration rather than operate underground so to speak as they previously did. Registration also causes problems for funders, as they have to make decisions about whether to only work with registered groups. This was an issue that Jukic raised, although he said Sapan do not just work with registered groups, although this causes some complications (Interview 2013). In addition, the impact of lese majeste restricts the freedom of speech groups face, an issue raised by Book Re:public. However, the popularity of these laws mean that not only may legal threats arise but also intimidation, as the owners of Book Re:public claimed (Laungaramsri, Interview 2013).

The strength of feeling for different political leanings, as manifested in the protests of 2013, demonstrates the problematic nature of the Thai political landscape. Several interviewees claimed that they feared violence between the different political groupings. This level of fear and distrust impacts civil society’s ability to organise and mobilise in the long-term.

In addition, there is also the problem of the state co-opting civil society, and directing support (often financial) towards particular groups. This has been a criticism of the Health Fund, in that money gets diverted towards groups that are particularly supportive of the government rather than necessarily being effective. These dynamics work to reduce the activist characteristics within civil society and weaken its ability to hold public bodies and the government to account. Whilst making civil society more subservient to the government and reducing activist tendencies, it also reduces the possibility for international interaction.

Overall the political landscape is not wholly positive for civil society, however it would be wrong to completely dismiss the possibility of strengthening civil society within this context.
Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion, through examination of the interaction between the grassroots and the international in Thailand’s civil society, it is apparent there are limitations in the relationship in part explained by weaknesses in Thailand’s civil society and the context it finds itself in.

Although international interaction is said to raise issues of participation and legitimacy, it is clear that by remaining localised groups there are barriers to ensuring the long-term effective organisation that would encourage better participation and greater legitimacy for civil society. The current levels of interaction are not great enough to raise issues of the legitimacy of influence in Thailand. Whilst international funding is lacking and is supporting some issues more than others, it is not that influential in what projects get support generally in Thailand. In part this is because of a determination by Thai civil society groups to not be co-opted by international donors and also because the impact of civil society in Thailand is often not that great.

Recommendations for international donors

This study has come across a growing belief that civil society in Thailand does not need international funding. Whilst the economic development of Thailand is indeed higher than many of its neighbours, civil society remains weak and this indeed remains an issue for democracy in Thailand. Although there is much mistrust on the Thai side, greater collaboration would indeed help strengthen civil society, and part of the responsibility for this lies on the international side. DAI’s role of acting as a mediator between Thai civil society groups and USAID shows how the gaps between funders and grassroots civil society can be bridged and provides many positive example of the benefits of collaboration. However, as the USAID funding for the Sapan project comes to an end, questions about the long-term prospects should be raised. Many of the civil society groups receiving support still remain distanced from international donors and could do with continued help. Work such as this should continue if Thailand’s civil society is to be stronger and internationally focused.

Recommendations for Thai civil society

This study has come across general weaknesses in Thai civil society. Whilst Thai civil society groups may not be able to fully change the context they work in, they could do more to strengthen their position. Firstly, Thai civil society remains unorganised and underdeveloped compared to civil society internationally. There is much it could gain from a willingness to interact with international civil society and build stronger relations with donors. Whilst there are obviously issues raised through international funding, such as the impact of funders on civil society groups’ plans, they do also bring resources and information and ways of organising and could be of great benefit to Thai civil society. Secondly, and more importantly, Thai civil society groups need to start looking in the long-term both at their organisation and also their impact. Monitoring and evaluation of civil society practices in Thailand are weak and could help strengthen the power of civil society.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role of Organisation</th>
<th>Type of Civil Society</th>
<th>Individual Interviewed</th>
<th>Role of Interviewee</th>
<th>Date of Interview/Time spent with organisation</th>
<th>Links to other organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAI</td>
<td>Development organisation funded by USAID to promote democracy in Thailand by working with local civil society through Sapan Project, governance groups</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Marjan Jukic</td>
<td>Regional Programme</td>
<td>10/09/2013</td>
<td>Supports Book Re:Public, Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Watch</td>
<td>Network of civil society activists NGO focused on civil society activism and democracy</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Kingkorn Narintarakul</td>
<td>Director of BioThai (part of the network)</td>
<td>18/09/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Re:Public promotion</td>
<td>NGO focused on civil society activism and education on minority rights</td>
<td>Minority Rights-LGBT</td>
<td>Anjana Suvarnananda,</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>30/09/2013</td>
<td>Worked with DAI. Funded by International Jewish Service; links to regional LGBT groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjaree</td>
<td>NGO focused on civil society activism and education on minority rights</td>
<td>Minority Rights-Gender Equality</td>
<td>Thanavadee Thajeen</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>03/10/2013</td>
<td>Worked with Sapan. Some regional connections on the issue of trafficking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Type of Focus</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Funders</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWNT</td>
<td>NGO focused on civil society activism and education on minority rights and some service provision</td>
<td>Minority Rights-Indigenous Rights</td>
<td>13/10/2013-17/10/2013</td>
<td>Funded by Mama Cash, and other small funders. Connections with international indigenous rights groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPECT</td>
<td>NGO focused on civil society activism and education on minority rights, and some service provision</td>
<td>Minority Rights-Indigenous Rights and Gender Equality</td>
<td>13/10/2013-17/10/2013</td>
<td>Funded by Jesuit Refugee Services amongst other small funders; connections with international indigenous groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raks Thai</td>
<td>NGO focused on service provision and with advocacy and campaigning elements</td>
<td>Development and minority Rights-e.g. migrant workers, Supports civil society actors and social entrepreneurs</td>
<td>22/10/2013</td>
<td>Part of Care International; had to fund own funders, including EU and Global Health Fund. Part of Ashoka international network Funded by EU and USAID. Trying to establish regional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka</td>
<td>International network of civil society actors and social entreprenuers.</td>
<td>Supports civil society actors and entreprenuers</td>
<td>24/10/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Civil Society Management</td>
<td>Provides education and resources for civil society activists as well as research</td>
<td>Supports governance and minority Rights activisits</td>
<td>29/10/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Specific Project (if any)</td>
<td>International Assistance</td>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>Based</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAI</td>
<td>SAPAN</td>
<td>Funded by USAID</td>
<td>Promotes cooperation between civil society actors in Thailand and</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td><a href="http://dai.com/our-work/projects/thailand%E2%80%94sapan">http://dai.com/our-work/projects/thailand—sapan</a></td>
<td>Development Company; acted as bridge between funder (USAID) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>government agencies; encourage civil society as a check and balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grassroots civil society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and effective government; trains and supports fellows (civil society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leaders); change through a strong community base; information sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka</td>
<td>Fellowships; youth</td>
<td>Ashoka- international</td>
<td>&quot;Development of a peaceful and prosperous area&quot;</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ashoka.org/country/thailand">https://www.ashoka.org/country/thailand</a></td>
<td>Service provision to help civil society leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>venture projects</td>
<td>network of social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://asiafoundation.org/project/projectsearch.php?country=thailand">http://asiafoundation.org/project/projectsearch.php?country=thailand</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asia Foundation is non-</td>
<td>Women's empowerment; has projects on trafficking and works with hill-</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td><a href="http://www.womenthai.org/eng">http://www.womenthai.org/eng</a></td>
<td>Non profit development company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>profit intl development</td>
<td>tribes as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>Various international</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td><a href="http://www.womenthai.org/eng">http://www.womenthai.org/eng</a></td>
<td>Civil Society organisation- undertaking campaignin and providing a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Naumann Stiftung</td>
<td>FNS is a German foundation for liberal politics</td>
<td><a href="http://www.en.freiheit.org/Southeast-and-East-Asia/1044c1170i744/index.htm">http://www.en.freiheit.org/Southeast-and-East-Asia/1044c1170i744/index.htm</a></td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>Non profit development company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konrad-Adenauer Stiftung</td>
<td>KAS is a political foundation, closely linked with Christian Democrat Union of Germany</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kas.de/thailand/en/">http://www.kas.de/thailand/en/</a></td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>Non profit development company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Civil society and co-ordination centre</td>
<td>Project Thailand: development in the North</td>
<td><a href="https://www.dur.ac.uk/project.thailand/">https://www.dur.ac.uk/project.thailand/</a></td>
<td>Nan, North Thailand</td>
<td>Service provision to help civil society actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham University Project</td>
<td>Has worked with groups such as No Sweat, Oxfam and numerous NGOs (local/intl) and advocacy groups</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mapfoundationcm.org/eng/">http://www.mapfoundationcm.org/eng/</a></td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td>NGO - mainly with advocacy/activism elements (Website not set up yet; uses Facebook to promote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP Foundation</td>
<td>Migrant worker rights and labour rights generally</td>
<td><a href="http://www.empowerfoundation.org/index_en.html">http://www.empowerfoundation.org/index_en.html</a></td>
<td>Bangkok (with activists elsewhere)</td>
<td>NGO - mainly with advocacy/activism elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjaree</td>
<td>Received funds from American Jewish Service; LGBT rights</td>
<td><a href="http://www.empowerfoundation.org/index_en.html">http://www.empowerfoundation.org/index_en.html</a></td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td>NGO - mainly with advocacy/activism elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower Foundation</td>
<td>Has links with sex workers unions across the world and has worked with NGOs, IGOs etc in educational capacity</td>
<td><a href="http://www.empowerfoundation.org/index_en.html">http://www.empowerfoundation.org/index_en.html</a></td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td>NGO - mainly with advocacy/activism elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Type/Description</td>
<td>Funders/Activities</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raks Thai Foundation</td>
<td>Part of Care Foundation</td>
<td>Advocacy projects and development projects; large projects on health and migrant workers</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td><a href="http://www.raksthai.org/new/option=&amp;task=&amp;tr_id=&amp;cat=&amp;lang=en">http://www.raksthai.org/new/option=&amp;task=&amp;tr_id=&amp;cat=&amp;lang=en</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sisters</td>
<td>Civil society action team on HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Global Fund; also reg/intl links</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td><a href="http://www.csactionteam.org/?hub=55">http://www.csactionteam.org/?hub=55</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Re:public</td>
<td>Café democracy</td>
<td>Receives funds from USAID</td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td><a href="http://bookrepublic.org/">http://bookrepublic.org/</a> (In Thai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Women</td>
<td>Women's empowerment (regional)</td>
<td>Receives funds from USAID and EU</td>
<td>Bangkok (with regional offices elsewhere)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mplus+</td>
<td>Very little; some groups have regional contacts</td>
<td>Originally funded by USAID</td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ftawatch.org/">http://www.ftawatch.org/</a> (In Thai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Mai (with activists elsewhere)</td>
<td>Collaborative organisation for advocacy and activism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Focus Area</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>empowerment of hill tribes</td>
<td>some intl funding (e.g. Kindermission and Jesuit Refugee Service)</td>
<td>Indigenous rights and development</td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td><a href="http://www.imp">http://www.imp</a> ect.org/Index.php?language=en</td>
<td>NGO with advocacy/activism elements and service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWNT (indigenous women's network of thailand)</td>
<td>empowerment of indigenous women</td>
<td>work with regional contacts; funding through Mama Cash</td>
<td>Indigenous rights and development</td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td><a href="http://iwnt.webs.com/">http://iwnt.webs.com/</a></td>
<td>NGO with advocacy/activism elements and service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioWatch</td>
<td>Environmental concerns; anti-FTA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Part of FTA Watch; campaigns to prevent economic agreements that don't consider the needs of maligned groups</td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>NGO mainly with advocacy/activism elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>