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Editorial

Elections are the hallmark of democracy. Organising regular elections has become the accepted international norm for legitimate governance. The election norm is even practiced in non-democratic states. Therefore, it would be wrong to equate elections with democracy. But if a state manages to organise a series of free and fair elections over time, democracy is likely to be consolidated.

Free and fair elections
In 2009, successful elections were held in quite a few NIMD programme countries, including Bolivia, Ecuador, Ghana, Indonesia, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa. In Ghana, the fourth general elections since the return to multiparty democracy resulted in the peaceful handover of power from the governing NPP party to the opposition NDC. It was the second peaceful alternation of power in that young democracy. The consolidation of democracy in Indonesia also took a step ahead with the third successful general elections since the fall of the Suharto regime.

Political parties carry a special responsibility for the conduct of free, fair and peaceful elections. In NIMD-supported programmes, political parties increasingly cooperate with the national electoral commission to ensure the appropriate conditions for elections. The political parties programme in Ghana has provided a framework for the transition process, a framework that will be enacted into a new presidential transition bill.

Democratic reforms
The time to consider the reforms required to make democracy perform better is when the dust of the elections has settled, and the next elections are not yet on the horizon. In all NIMD programme countries, democratic reforms are pursued in one way or another – be it through constitutional reforms, electoral reforms, political party legislation, public funding for parties or otherwise.
In a number of NIMD programmes reforms are pursued through often-contested constitutional review processes. In these processes, a new covenant between the state and its citizens is pursued, along with new checks and balances in the political system. In 2009, constitutional reform processes were on-going in Bolivia, Ecuador, Kenya, Zimbabwe and Zambia.

The NIMD Knowledge Centre has produced the handbook ‘Writing Autobiographies of Nations’ on constitutional reforms, based on lessons learned in five NIMD programme countries. One of the lessons is that the process is as important as the content of constitutional reforms. Ideally, constitutional reform processes should be as inclusive and participatory as possible, contributing to the consolidation of democracy.

**Dialogue**
The NIMD programme has resulted in the establishment of Centres for Multiparty Democracy (CMD) in eleven countries. These CMDs act as conduits for inter-party dialogue and drivers of change for democratic reforms in their respective countries. Increasingly, they foster linkages between political and civil society, and some are expanding their reach from the national level to the provincial levels.

The challenge of facilitating political dialogue and applying the inclusive approach that NIMD promotes in post-conflict countries has yielded results in Burundi and Uganda. With help from political party leaders in Ghana, the political parties of Uganda have reached an agreement to establish their own inter-party dialogue platform, which was inaugurated at a ceremony in Kampala on 5 February 2010. Meanwhile in Burundi, a step in the consolidation of democracy was taken on 4 February 2010, when political parties signed an agreement for the establishment of a permanent dialogue forum.

**Ten years of partnership**
This year NIMD celebrates its tenth anniversary. On 18 April 2000, seven political parties across the political spectrum decided to work together and found the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy. NIMD currently works with more than 150 political parties from 17 partner countries in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Eastern Europe.

In June 2009, for the third time in NIMD’s ten-year existence, all partners met in Nairobi, Kenya, for the NIMD Partnership Days. At the event, partners from four continents actively shared their experience in democracy building and political party development. Valuable stories were shared. Many of them have been recorded and made available in print, on DVD and the NIMD website.

Some of these stories are highlighted in this magazine. As these stories provide an account of the results that partners have achieved, they provide a strong incentive for NIMD to continue building on the established partnerships and further invest in programmes that help political parties bring about the political reforms necessary to make democracies perform better.
Helping democracies to find their own path

‘Development cooperation cannot work if it ends up in the pockets of the ruling clique. This is why we also place great emphasis on being accountable.’

Interview with Bernard Bot, President of NIMD
By Silvia Rottenberg

— How did you become involved with NIMD?
When I was asked to become President of NIMD, I had heard about the organisation, but I did not know immediately exactly what it stood for. After a number of conversations with my predecessor Mr Van Kemenade, and other board members, I concluded: “It sounds like a good idea, I will accept without hesitation.” I consider it an honour to have been asked.

— Were you particularly interested in democracy and democratisation?
Through my many years abroad, both in the diplomatic service and as a minister, I came into contact with so many regimes where democracy was dysfunctional and that made me realise that the constitutional state, as it exists in the Netherlands, should be a priority. The constitutional state stands for a peaceful world: it means that democratic processes within countries are running properly.

— You talked about the importance of this in a speech at the Humboldt University in Berlin in 2004.
I was discussing Rousseau, among others, and, although I am not a supporter of all aspects of his work, I do agree with the idea that people relinquish some of their rights or freedom to higher authorities and that those higher authorities are then accountable. That accountability is precisely what is lacking in many countries, such as in Iraq and in various places elsewhere in the world, where many dictatorial and semi-dictatorial regimes still exist. It is clear that people there would like to have more control over their own destinies. That they want to have a say in how their country, region or their village is run. That is the essence of democracy: knowing that you are involved and that you have a vote.

Citizens should feel that they are being governed by someone they trust, someone who wants the best for them. Then they can adapt to and accept the situation. Not in a coerced way, as in Iran or in Myanmar, but as it is here in the Netherlands or in other democracies. Many models are conceivable. What I admire about NIMD is that, in the countries where we are active, we do not simply impose a Dutch, British or French democratic model, but offer people a platform so that they themselves can determine how they wish to be governed.

— You talk about people in general, but in the countries where NIMD is active, the organisation works mainly with the political elite and other political movements. How do you regard this in the light of broader democratisation processes?
NIMD works with the political elite to induce them to invest in the development of democratic rule. Politicians in ruling parties are encouraged to work together with the opposition and to consider the various models of democracy. We also explain to the political heavyweights that the essence of democracy entails politicians being accountable to the citizens. Accepting that accountability involves serving the needs of the population.

I have been asked this question on a number of occasions – the aim of working with the political elite is precisely to convey the fact that power is something that has to be accounted for, and that you should take the opposition into account. For example, you cannot remain in office if you have lost the elections. This realisation is a gradual process and it does not happen overnight. This is, I believe, also a misconception here in the Netherlands. We are not building bridges or roads. It is a process of trial and error. We must be patient. We cannot change a system in four years. But we can gradually ensure
that things move in the right direction, that there is no further slipping back into a one-party system, where the opposition no longer has the slightest chance.

— This seems to be happening now in one of the countries where NIMD is active – Bolivia. President Evo Morales’ MAS has a great deal of power. Can NIMD play a role in a political situation such as this? When all power rests with one party then something is wrong. There is no country in the world that has ever been governed well by one party holding practically all the power. We have witnessed this in Russia and in China. We are currently seeing it in Myanmar. The MAS should not focus on methods à la Castro or à la Chavez, who also embarked on ruling with the best of intentions, but who now de facto lead one-party states. Bolivia finds itself in a historic process of transition: It is a country where, for centuries, a majority was oppressed by a minority. Now that they have gained a majority by peaceful, democratic means, there is the threat that people consider absolute power necessary to carry through further essential reforms. In theory, the Bolivian president is, I know, interested in democratic processes and he is also keen to carry them through, but he faces pressure from his own party and a fierce opposition, as a result of which he is switching over to means that are once again undemocratic. Does that mean NIMD should quit? No, all the more reason to continue. The Bolivians whom I met [during the Partnership Days – see pp 20–21 of this publication] demonstrate that this is also possible. A representative of the MAS attended this conference, as did someone from PODEMOS. It was highly encouraging to see how well they got on together in the end. That is only possible if a unifying body such as NIMD exists.

— How can NIMD then bring about democracy? How does the work fit in within development cooperation? Democracy is participation by the people, involving the opposition, listening carefully to what people want and how they want it. It is not up to us how a country organises its society. It is important that everyone has the right to express his or her opinion, without ending up in
prison or being dispossessed of his or her property. These are, after all, the measures that should be taken. NIMD encourages partners in every country to search for the most appropriate formula for creating a constitutional state and provides them with all the relevant information available. These are the chief characteristics of the organisation. Wherever I go, everyone is really amazed about the simplicity of the formula on the one hand, and the inventiveness and originality of that concept on the other. That you just say: democracy is a do-it-yourself process, create a platform, involve local experts and enter into dialogue with politicians and explain how democratic systems work and how to comply with them. I think it is a splendid concept. And it works!

Moreover, development cooperation can, of course, only run smoothly and sustainable development can only become embedded if some degree of a constitutional state and a certain form of democracy exist. You see this everywhere. Development cooperation cannot work if it ends up in the pockets of the ruling clique. This is why we also place great emphasis on being accountable.

You talk chiefly about the constitutional state and you use the word democracy infrequently.

Democracy is a generic term, but in the South it is too frequently identified with a western system. And we do not wish to impose our system, on the contrary. That is the strength of NIMD.

You have been President of NIMD for two and a half years now – what have those two and a half years been like?

It turned out to be a far more difficult task than I had imagined. This was also because one and a half years after my appointment, NIMD ran into stormy weather. That cost an incredible amount of time and effort. We had to carry on working and eliminate all sources of misunderstanding. Although I am well aware that, in the preceding period, “mistakes” – because I would not like to call them more than that – were made and that there were inadequacies in communication, I remain of the opinion that they were not so consequential that the interruption of the normal activities for such a long period was justifiable. I know of no other institution, and I am on the board of five other organisations, that has been subject to such a rigorous investigation regime. We have turned everything upside down. Anybody can see that we act strictly according to the law and the regulations. All are welcome to inspect our results, which are not only good but widely recognised internationally. And anyone who examines us will come to this same conclusion. Most of the effort went into reversing the temporary immobilisation of activities as quickly as possible. I would have preferred things to have been done differently. But if you then visit Kenya and you meet all the partners, you realise what splendid work we do. When those people tell you what our presence has achieved in those countries, then you cannot be anything but enthusiastic.

You are very positive about the meetings with partners. You also visited Indonesia. What was that like?

During the Partnership Days I spoke with everyone. Despite setbacks, there is growing interest in the importance of democracy in every country. I did indeed find that heart-warming. I was extremely enthusiastic when I returned from my visit to Indonesia. I witnessed how the democracy schools function in practice.

What I admire about NIMD is that we do not simply impose a Dutch, British or French democratic model, but offer people a platform so that they themselves can determine how they wish to be governed.’

We visited one of the schools on a Saturday morning. People travel there by bike or moped. You must understand that they give up a free day to go to school! Men and women follow lessons together. There is a proactive, non-discriminatory policy – which is not an every-day occurrence in Indonesia. At the school, hopefully they learn to become responsible politicians who, among other things, will subsequently pass on this non-discriminatory policy. The teachers were extremely enthusiastic and worked with assignments written on the blackboard. The participants, in teams of four or five, had to work on these assignments. It became a sort of competition to see who had the best solution for the problem.

What kinds of issues were raised?

The basics of political work: learning how to formulate and write an article, resolve conflict peacefully, prepare a presentation for television, draft a programme. Aspects that we take for granted, things we think people already know, but no, this is not the case because the instruments of democracy have only recently become available. This is what is taught at the democracy schools and subsequently propagated and put into practice.
You speak very passionately about it. Yes, it is one of the finest organisations of which I have the honour to be President. I believe firmly in NIMD’s mission. I have seen enough in the world to be certain about one thing: that in all countries where dictatorships prevail there is no constitutional state and no economic growth. These are countries that slowly suffocate. I had first-hand experience of this in my time behind the Iron Curtain. I was the first western diplomat in East Germany and I was there for almost four years. You then personally experience what such a system means. The misery it creates. Whole generations were lost. In the years between 1950 and 1989 people had to watch every opportunity pass them by, and any fun in life had practically vanished.

— Did you yourself experience this?

We were in a privileged position, of course, but we also lived in a small apartment with East Germans in the same regime. Fortunately, my children were able to go to school in West Berlin, but there were all sorts of obstacles. We could not speak freely as we do here. We did our talking outdoors on the street, but not under any trees because they, too, might have bugging devices hanging in them. So you become as nervous as a rabbit, always afraid of being caught, not even daring to think for yourself. Because the neighbours might betray you. You can watch films about it nowadays, but there I was totally immersed in the system. Now I truly know what freedom and democracy really mean. It is just like pain. If you feel no pain you cannot imagine what pain is, and if you do feel pain everything is truly unbearable. This is just the same as it is with the absence of freedom and democracy. When this is the case it feels tremendously claustrophobic. But if you live as we do here in the Netherlands, then it is something you take for granted, like inhaling fresh air – you never give it a moment’s thought. You only notice it when it is lacking. How oppressive it is. How powerless you are as a citizen, as if you are being herded like cattle in one particular direction. If you are not free to choose where you live, how much you eat, where your children go to school, where and what kind of work you do, when and where you may go on holiday, what you watch on television, the list goes on and on. I believe that the lack of intellectual freedom is often worse than the living conditions. People can endure a great deal, but intellectual constraint is genuinely dreadful. This is why NIMD should help people to gain that freedom and retain it.

How do you envisage the future of NIMD?

I am, of course, ambitious. The Danes, Belgians and Canadians – everywhere people are enthusiastic about this concept and it is seen as a truly excellent way of promoting democracy and the constitutional state. What I am keen to see is not only consolidation of what we are already doing, but also being given the opportunity to prudently expand these activities, because I see how many countries would truly appreciate our presence there: we receive requests from Ukraine to Macedonia and from Burundi to Afghanistan.

— The requests often come via embassies. What prevents them from doing NIMD’s work?

The embassies cannot do our work because they are representatives of the Dutch government and NIMD is not. The embassies would quickly be accused of interfering in a country’s internal affairs. What we set up there belongs to the country itself. NIMD is an impartial organisation in that country. We act on behalf of the parties and for the parties and not on behalf of or for the government. And the parties have never said that we should operate according to a specific concept. We create a platform and we do not interfere in the realisation. Then there is the example in Kenya of Njeri Kabeberi, who is not seen as someone from NIMD, but as someone from the country, someone who knows how to bring the parties together.

— Have you met Njeri Kabeberi?

Yes, she is an impressive woman. She has an inner conviction that what we are doing is necessary and must be carried through. She gains recognition and appreciation for her efforts, but would have done so regardless. Yes, that is the spirit.

— Do you regard the work of NIMD as a form of diplomacy that is compatible with your career and expertise?

NIMD pursues disinterested diplomacy. We propagate a particular concept about the development and support of democracy and in this way contribute to a more peaceful world. We must continue actively to embrace this principle. It is not diplomacy in the sense of promoting Dutch commercial interests or supporting specific groups of Dutch men and women abroad, but we do want to help people find their own path and we do this in quite a unique way. Let us continue to do so. That would be my greatest wish.
Njeri Kebeberi is NIMD’s programme coordinator in Kenya and the Director of the Centre for Multiparty Democracy in Kenya (CMD-K). In the aftermath of the troubled 2007 elections, CMD-K played a visible and constructive role in fostering a multi-actor dialogue. In this interview, Njeri speaks with Hélène Michaud about her work and her own role in healing Kenya’s ethnic divisions.

“When you do the kind of work we do, going out on the streets, being beaten up, tear-gassed, vilified and abused, you never imagine that anyone would honour you for doing that, you just think that you are doing what you have to do.

“If only Kenyans would appreciate these medals as much as we appreciate the medals we get from our athletes”, sighs human rights defender Njeri Kabeberi.

In October 2009 Ms Kabeberi was awarded two prizes: a Humanity Award by the Frankfurt Chamber of Lawyers in Germany, and a Democracy Ribbon in the Netherlands, for her commitment to human rights and democracy in Kenya. We met before the ceremony in The Hague, not very far from the International Criminal Court (ICC) where Kenya’s post-electoral violence is being examined.

Half joking, Ms Kabeberi remarks that had she been an athlete, she would have been given an escort and a uniform by the Kenyan authorities. But as far as the international recognition she has just received for her twenty year sprint in the field of human rights is concerned, she has received no words of praise from the government. “A prophetess not honoured in her country”, as a Daily Nation columnist put it.

Ethnicity
She does not seem surprised, recalling that she was among twelve Kenyans who appeared on a hit list after the country’s descent into the abyss following the disputed 2007 Presidential elections. Accused of trying to broker peace between the various ethnic communities instead of showing loyalty to the leaders of her own community, Ms Kabeberi did not dare to remain in her home for several months after receiving death threats. Around 1,000 people were killed and over 500,000 displaced in that period.

Ethnicity, she says, is Kenya’s ‘weak link’, and it is exploited at will by the political establishment. President Mwai Kibaki (whose election was confirmed in 2008 following a power-sharing agreement with his rival Raila Odinga) “has excelled in playing the ethnic card”. But ordinary Kenyans, she points out, “are not ethnically-oriented. They don’t wake up every morning thinking how they are going to harm the other community.”

By Hélène Michaud, Radio Netherlands Worldwide (RNW)

Wim Kolijn
Chair, SGP (State Reformed Party)

Why we support NIMD
In addition to economic growth and improving education, infrastructure and health care, upgrading the quality of the existing political order in many countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America is also of great importance for the welfare of the population. This requires a transparent government, one that is trustworthy and not corrupt, fair elections and an independent judiciary. Because there, too, people are inclined to every evil. Democracy also means that people do not regard their political opponents as needing to be rooted out and destroyed completely – or in any event silenced, but as partners in the political arena.

In the past ten years NIMD has, without doubt, been able to make a limited but not unimportant contribution to promoting democracy. That offers perspective for the future, although in this context it is very important that there is continuing, adequate support among the participating Dutch parties and in Dutch politics.
Part of her recent efforts with CMD-K, of which she is the director, has been to “build bridges of understanding” between the different groups and bring them not only to acknowledge and accept their differences but even to celebrate that diversity.

“We all need to more or less be in love with each other so that we can enjoy that country that we inherited from God.”

In the tense period that followed the contested elections, her main contribution was to serve as a ‘shuttle’ between political parties as well as women’s groups she had previously worked with and two other civil society organisations. “The CMD-K is respected by all groups so we even facilitated some of the meetings in our offices.”

**Human rights**

Ms Kabeberi, who has devoted most of her adult life to defending human rights both at home and in East and Southern Africa, says her understanding of concepts such as democracy and human rights has deepened since she first got involved in campaigns for the liberation of political prisoners in Kenya, and her work with Amnesty International.

For a long time, she and other Kenyans fought for multiparty democracy as an alternative to the one-party state. When she joined the Netherlands-supported CMD-K, there were over 160 political parties in Kenya. None of these parties, however, counted women, youth, people with disabilities or minority groups among their members. “They were just patriarchal parties.” She came to the conclusion that in true multiparty politics, it is not sufficient to have many parties: these parties, as she sees it now, should be ‘inclusive’.

Ms Kabeberi’s travels abroad, where she first confronted manifestations of gay rights, prompted her to redefine her conception of human rights: “I found people demanding rights that I had never thought about. So now I say that you judge a country’s development and respect for human rights by how it deals with minority groups and gay rights.”

---

**Njeri Kabeberi**

**Curriculum Vitae**

- **1991**
  - First chair of pressure group Release Political Prisoners (RPP)

- **1993-2006**
  - Board member of the Kenya Human Rights Commission

- **1994-1996**
  - Citizens Coalition for Constitutional Change

- **1997-2004**
  - Amnesty International, Development Coordinator for East & Southern Africa.

- **2004-2009**
  - Executive Director of the Centre for Multiparty Democracy Kenya (CMD-K) and country coordinator for the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy.

- **2009**
  - Winner of three international awards for fighting for human rights and democracy in Kenya (Kenya, Germany, Netherlands)
In 2007, the Secretary-General of the United Nations called for 15 September to be celebrated as the International Day of Democracy, a day “meant both to celebrate democracy and to serve as a reminder that the need to promote and protect democracy is as urgent now as ever” (UN Resolution A/RES/62/7).

In 2009 NIMD, together with the Forum for Democratic Development (FDO) and the European Partnership for Democracy (EPD), organised the first International Day of Democracy in the Netherlands. A mixed company attended the ceremony where Heroes of Democracy were honoured for their dedication to building bridges in society. Heroes of Democracy from the Molucca Islands to Kenya were rewarded for their contribution to the democratic body of ideas with a cash prize and a Democracy Ribbon, presented by Frits Huffnagel, Alderman in The Hague.

The Democracy Ribbons are conferred on four levels: local, national, European and international. At the local level Stichting Kantara was honoured for the work that it does to stimulate citizen participation in De Baarsjes, a neighbourhood in Amsterdam. In 2009 their ‘Kamervragen’ and ‘Vrij uit’ projects, among others, brought the work of parliament closer to the local community and the foundation stimulated discussion on freedom of speech. Farida Pattisahuswi-van Bommel, Chair of Stichting Vrouwen voor Vrede op de Molukken, (a women’s foundation for peace on the Moluccan Islands) received the Democracy Ribbon for establishing inter-religious dialogue in the Moluccas. This work spans a bridge between the democratic values in the Netherlands, where Farida Pattisahuswi lives, and the country where she was born, where mutual trust needs a stimulus. By enabling women with differing backgrounds to talk to each other, she prepares a path for advancing peace in the Moluccas and she deserves this honour.

At the European level, Jan Marinus Wiersma received the award. For years, most notably as a member of the European Parliament but also outside it, he has devoted himself to promoting democracy in eastern European countries following the revolutions twenty years ago. Wiersma now also focuses on and draws attention to Belarus, the last dictatorship on the continent. His chairmanship of SPOLU International, dedicated to improving the rights of Roma minorities in European member states, demonstrates his ceaseless engagement with democratic values.

With her two European medals and another “even more humbling” award she received in July in Kenya from the Mau Mau freedom fighters for helping push for the recognition in parliament of their contribution to Kenya’s independence, Njeri Kabeberi is more determined than ever to put on her running shoes and make sure she completes the race.

In 2007, the Secretary-General of the United Nations called for 15 September to be celebrated as the International Day of Democracy, a day “meant both to celebrate democracy and to serve as a reminder that the need to promote and protect democracy is as urgent now as ever” (UN Resolution A/RES/62/7).

In 2009 NIMD, together with the Forum for Democratic Development (FDO) and the European Partnership for Democracy (EPD), organised the first International Day of Democracy in the Netherlands. A mixed company attended the ceremony where Heroes of Democracy were honoured for their dedication to building bridges in society. Heroes of Democracy from the Molucca Islands to Kenya were rewarded for their contribution to the democratic body of ideas with a cash prize and a Democracy Ribbon, presented by Frits Huffnagel, Alderman in The Hague.

The Democracy Ribbons are conferred on four levels: local, national, European and international. At the local level Stichting Kantara was honoured for the work that it does to stimulate citizen participation in De Baarsjes, a neighbourhood in Amsterdam. In 2009 their ‘Kamervragen’ and ‘Vrij uit’ projects, among others, brought the work of parliament closer to the local community and the foundation stimulated discussion on freedom of speech. Farida Pattisahuswi-van Bommel, Chair of Stichting Vrouwen voor Vrede op de Molukken, (a women’s foundation for peace on the Moluccan Islands) received the Democracy Ribbon for establishing inter-religious dialogue in the Moluccas. This work spans a bridge between the democratic values in the Netherlands, where Farida Pattisahuswi lives, and the country where she was born, where mutual trust needs a stimulus. By enabling women with differing backgrounds to talk to each other, she prepares a path for advancing peace in the Moluccas and she deserves this honour.

At the European level, Jan Marinus Wiersma received the award. For years, most notably as a member of the European Parliament but also outside it, he has devoted himself to promoting democracy in eastern European countries following the revolutions twenty years ago. Wiersma now also focuses on and draws attention to Belarus, the last dictatorship on the continent. His chairmanship of SPOLU International, dedicated to improving the rights of Roma minorities in European member states, demonstrates his ceaseless engagement with democratic values.

With her two European medals and another “even more humbling” award she received in July in Kenya from the Mau Mau freedom fighters for helping push for the recognition in parliament of their contribution to Kenya’s independence, Njeri Kabeberi is more determined than ever to put on her running shoes and make sure she completes the race.

Future

Is it not time for the activist to run for office? It’s a question she’s been asked often. Her ‘no’ is not categorical. She says she needs to prepare the ground first. “I’d rather be outside cleaning that system so that when I’m in that system I can actually give to Kenyans that which I’ve always preached.”

With her two European medals and another “even more humbling” award she received in July in Kenya from the Mau Mau freedom fighters for helping push for the recognition in parliament of their contribution to Kenya’s independence, Njeri Kabeberi is more determined than ever to put on her running shoes and make sure she completes the race.

---

Njeri Kabeberi speaks at the Democracy Ribbon award ceremony in The Hague, the Netherlands, on 3 November 2009

---

Njeri Kabeberi was the fourth to receive the Democracy Ribbon. She received the prize for her work in Kenya, most notably after the conflicts that arose following the 2007/2008 elections. She succeeded in bringing various parties together there and building bridges for the advancement of democracy in Kenya.

The organising parties wish to celebrate the Day of Democracy again in 2010 and have also urged other organisations to join in. In the meantime, preparations are well under way for a meeting of experts and a public event as a continuation of the presentation of the Democracy Ribbons. On 15 September 2010 democracy will once again be the subject of discussion in a day of celebration that, hopefully, will become a worthy tradition.
Political parties in Uganda agree to dialogue

By Marcia Luyten

Political parties in Uganda have agreed to a dialogue with a view to contributing to free and fair elections early next year and long-term democratic reforms. The agreement, which has been facilitated by NIMD, was sealed in February 2010 at a signing ceremony in the Ugandan capital Kampala.

All the Ugandan parties around one negotiating table, that is a breakthrough. How did the agreement come about? And what can the dialogue achieve? Kampala-based journalist Marcia Luyten talked with political leaders and other stakeholders to find out.

Never before had six political parties from Uganda sat round one table: one leader and five opposition parties. Augustine Ruzindana, head of the most important opposition party, says: “We are talking to each other for the first time.” It could elevate the Interparty Dialogue, in which NIMD acted as intermediary, to become a historic reality. One year before the Ugandans elect a new president and parliament in 2011, the parties have officially agreed to meet each other on a regular basis for informal talks. That means, under guidance of the neutral outsider (NIMD) and behind closed doors. Sensitive issues can be left to settle, politicians can ask each other about specific interests that motivate their various points of view, so that compromises can come within reach. One British diplomat, present at the ceremonial signing of the Memorandum of Understanding on 5 February in Kampala, described it as “a breakthrough”.

The Vice-President of NIMD, Ruud Koole, also spoke at the ceremony. He said, “In a democracy you are political opponents. Not each other’s enemies.” Uganda has not reached that stage yet. President Yoweri Museveni and his most important challenger Kiza Besigye have not shaken hands for nine years. They never enter into debate with each other, because Museveni would refuse “as president to place himself on the same level with the opposition leader.” According to Ruzindana, Museveni’s National Resistance Movement (NRM) has always considered political opponents as “enemies who have to be crushed”. In any event the lives of the opposition are made a misery and that generates little mutual good will.
Museveni and Besigye: from comrades to political opponents

This animosity has its roots in the recent past. In 1986 the rebel army – the National Resistance Army – under the leadership of Museveni came to power. The young Museveni was idealistic. He promised Uganda a renaissance: no corruption, no dictatorship and no tribal discord. Following decades of violence, the restoration of national unity was like a balm to Uganda’s soul. To avert discord the new Uganda had no political parties. At birth everyone became a member of The Movement, the NRM. Under the guidance of the IMF and the World Bank, Museveni pursued a rigid macro-economic policy (low inflation, stable exchange rates). This yielded him billions of dollars in Western budget support and economic growth. He kept a tight rein on politics too. As long as his position of power was not at issue, the media were permitted to rail against him openly. Museveni seemed to have secured the stability and security that he had promised.

The old political parties led a dormant existence. Obote’s Uganda People’s Congress (UPC), the Democratic Party (DP) and the Conservative Party (CP) did exist, but were not permitted to develop party activities. Party members contended for their seats in parliament in a private capacity. Political meetings were banned. It was not until Kiza Besigye broke away from Museveni’s NRM in 2001 and challenged him in the presidential elections of that year, that Museveni faced his first real democratic opponent. Doctor Kiza Besigye was a comrade from the bush war. For years he was Museveni’s personal physician. Besigye married the woman whom Museveni loved. In 2004 Augustine Ruzindana, also a former NRM member, together with Besigye established the Forum for Democratic Change (FDC). “As regards a multi-party democracy, Museveni had always contemplated the UPC and the Democratic Party”, says Ruzindana. He had not counted on a party originating from his own ranks. “The hostility towards us is therefore different from that towards the other parties.”

Elections

The presidential elections of 2001 were not particularly pleasant. Besigye challenged Museveni, but was compelled to flee the country, accused of treason. Voting was accompanied by a great deal of violence, says Simon Osborn, who works in Uganda for the Deepening Democracy Programme. Museveni was re-elected. In 2005, under pressure from the donors, Uganda held a referendum on multiparty democracy. A majority voted in favour. Political parties were reinstated. Remarkably, women were reserved about a new political system, according to Simon Osborn. In opinion polls they proved to be concerned about stability and national unity – both priorities for mothers, who are guardians of the family here.

At the end of 2005 Kiza Besigye of the FDC returned from exile. He was arrested: charged with treason, armed resistance and rape. There was no evidence for the last charge but the charge of treason was not retracted. After being released, during the campaign Besigye had to report to court every week. According to Osborn the government was determined that the 2006 elections should be an improvement on five years previously. The violence was less overt, says Augustine Ruzindana; “only ten people were shot”. Nonetheless the violence was omnipresent. “Throughout the country people were intimidated, beaten and bribed.” Officially, Kiza Besigye won more than 38% of the votes. According to the opposition parties the election results were rigged. “Massively rigged”, claims FDC’s Ruzindana. No more than 250,000 votes, thinks Simon Osborn on the basis of voting behaviour.

But Chris Opoka Okumu of the UPC is also convinced of massive fraud. “We all know soldiers who had to vote the whole day in 2006. They filled in stacks of forms, had a quick lunch and then carried on.” Opoka, Secretary General of Obote’s party, witnessed the opening of one ballot box in 2006. “Out rolled the ballot papers five or six all folded together.” Opoka now roars with laughter. “How is that possible if everyone casts one ballot paper.” The editor in chief of Uganda’s The Independent news—
In the build-up to the presidential elections in 2011 tension is mounting. Museveni wants to be re-elected. In a power struggle of divide and rule, the ethnic card is more and more frequently played. In September 2009 that led to serious clashes in which twenty-four people lost their lives. Even though “passionate hatred” prevails between NRM and FDC, Chris Opoka says that other opposition parties are also obstructed in their political work. None of the parties have open access to radio stations, the most important source of information for most Ugandans. There is a ban on meetings of more than twenty-five people on “a road, a field or in a residential area”. “How are we supposed to consult with our grass-roots support?” asks Opoka. “How can we run a campaign?”

Building trust
But the six parties did not enter into informal dialogue easily. Indeed, several attempts have been made in past years, by the Americans, among others. Following his last re-election, President Museveni also invited all the opposition candidates to tea but the FDC stayed away at the time. Little came of a consultative body. And so, not surprisingly, NIMD took a long run-up to the Inter Party Organisation for Dialogue (IPOD), as the dialogue is officially called. Simon Osborn recounts that, years ago, the then Dutch ambassador in Uganda, Joke Brandt, spoke with the second most powerful man in the NRM, Amama Mbabazi. On several occasions she told him about NIMD, and about the work that it has carried out since 2002 in Ghana. NIMD mediated in Ghana in an informal dialogue between the ruler and the opposition. There, too, parties share a history of civil war. In the meantime Ghana has twice succeeded in what Uganda has not, as yet, managed to achieve: a change of power without violence. In 2001 Jerry Rawlings’ party handed power over to John Kufuor’s party and won it back again in 2008. The lesson for Uganda: in a democracy you can lose power and regain it.

Mbabazi, Minister of Security and Secretary-General of NRM, visited NIMD in The Hague. The NRM was on board. But the other parties had not as yet come to the table. They were very distrustful, relates Shaun Mackay from NIMD. “They wondered whether this was an attempt by the NRM to split up the opposition. Or was the IPOD a sideshow while they were being taken for a ride once again?” The ice was somewhat broken in Ghana. NIMD took three politicians from each party to Accra. They were together for several days and talked with John Kufuor and other political heavyweights. Mackay: “The first seeds of trust were sown there.” Daudi Migereko went to Ghana on behalf of the NRM. As Government Chief Whip he is leader of the NRM party in parliament and he is the party’s spokesman on NRM’s engagement in the IPOD.

The rationale of dialogue
As far as the opposition parties are concerned, it is easier to guess their motives. They all have an interest in a fairer electoral process, a level playing field with equal opportunities and chances for all parties. Museveni has incensed the opposition by appointing an electoral committee with the same NRM faithful followers as in 2006. The first file to arrive on IPOD’s table was, not surprisingly, the amendment of the electoral laws. The FDC also hopes passionately that, via IPOD, politics will become more democratic. But Ruzindana is aiming at more: “We want to assure the leaders that they need not fear change. Many of them are corrupt, some are guilty of human rights violations. We want them to know that after the ‘changing of the guard’ we do not immediately plan to prosecute them.”
The reasons for the NRM’s participation are less clear. Surely they would be the big losers in genuinely free elections? Democracy researcher Simon Osborn: “Just why the NRM is participating is a question I ask myself every day.” Joseph Were of The Independent thinks that the international donors are stepping up the pressure on Museveni. “It is becoming increasingly difficult to defend a president who has already been in power for twenty-four years.” According to Chris Opoka of the UPC the NRM stands to gain a great deal: legitimacy and stability. “The NRM has the feeling that if the elections are stolen once again, the country will ignite.” The disturbances in September 2009 showed that one small incident can spark off violence. And both friend and foe agree on one thing: Uganda must not follow Kenya’s example.

Ruud Koole of NIMD subscribes to that analysis. According to him the NRM is afraid that the achievements of the revolution will be lost. “That is a legacy of national unity. In order to safeguard this, the NRM needs the cooperation of the opposition.” Simon Osborn also speculates about “a soft landing” that the NRM hopes to organise for itself: “Having lost power you can also win it back. As in Ghana.” What does the NRM say itself? Daudi Migereko: “We want to solve the problems by means of discussion and dialogue.” And: “We wish to consolidate democracy.” Moreover, it gives the NRM the opportunity of informing the opposition about how the big issues are being tackled. It works the other way round too. Migereko: “Even if the opposition lose the elections, they can still have interesting ideas.”

The Government Chief Whip repeatedly stresses that the NRM has championed a dialogue between parties for some time. Indeed, in 2006 President Museveni invited all the other presidential candidates to a meeting. It is a tale told by everyone, including Augustine Ruzindana (FDC). “Of course we didn’t accept the invitation. After the electoral fraud we weren’t going to give the president legitimacy. Now the NRM is keen to make it seem as if the IPOD is a continuation of that meeting.” So far, President Museveni has not put in an appearance at the IPOD. Does the president back the dialogue? NRM’s Chief Whip argues that he does. “We report to our boss. He gives us his advice.”

NIMD’s approach

NIMD has succeeded where others have failed. According to Ruud Koole, a professor of political science at Leiden University in his everyday life, this is because his organisation has created “quite a unique niche”: party political neutrality. Why was a dialogue possible now, all of a sudden? According to Chris Opoka because of NIMD’s approach: “They bring you together and then it’s completely up to you what subjects you discuss. Not like the Americans. They push you in a certain direction driven solely by self-interest. NIMD moderates to a small extent, but remains in the background. They never push - that doesn’t help, and they know that. They have a lot of experience with a process such as this.” All the Ugandan parties around one negotiating table, that is a breakthrough. But what else can the dialogue achieve? In the short term NIMD’s Shaun Mackay hopes for peaceful elections that receive broad acceptance. In the longer term the IPOD should develop into an institute, such as the Centres for Multiparty Democracy in Kenya, Malawi and Zambia.

“They never push – that doesn’t help, and they know that.’

The reform of the electoral laws will make or break the legitimacy of the IPOD. Mackay: “At this moment in time any compromise from the government is an important gesture.” Opoka predicts that, if the electoral laws are not substantially amended, the IPOD will prove a mere symbol. The 2011 elections will show us whether the Interparty Dialogue was a cunning move in the power struggle of East Africa’s longest-sitting president, or whether NIMD has made history in Uganda.
NIMD evaluated
Evaluations provide feedback for multi-annual plan

Every four years, NIMD asks an external agency to conduct an institutional evaluation. Currently, an evaluation is being carried out by the Institute of Development Policy and Management (IOB) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a semi-autonomous body specialising in evaluating international cooperation programmes. The programmes of seven Dutch organisations, including NIMD, are being evaluated.

– The implementation of the IOB evaluation has been granted to the Belgium consultancy firm ACE. The evaluation is due by the end of May 2010. The results of the evaluation will be made available on the NIMD website.
– Country programmes
One objective of the evaluation is to learn from capacity building approaches pursued by southern partners. What works and what does not, and how effective are the northern partners in delivering their assistance? The NIMD country programmes in Guatemala, Mali and Kenya have been evaluated as well as the West African Regional Programme. A number of desk studies of country programmes are also included in the evaluation.
– Organisation in The Hague
The institutional aspects of the NIMD organisation itself and its links with the Dutch political parties, are subjects of a complementary evaluation by the IOB-contracted team. This evaluation is being implemented simultaneously with the evaluation of capacity development in some of the NIMD programmes.
– Financial administration
To complete the scrutiny of NIMD’s programme, organisation and financial administration, the Ministry has granted Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) a contract to evaluate NIMD’s financial administration and cost structure. This evaluation report will also be made available to the public, and will be presented to the Dutch parliament, which requested such a report.
– Multi-annual plan 2010-2015
This year is the final year of the NIMD multi-annual programme 2007-2010. Consequently, we are currently preparing the third multi-annual programme 2011-2015, which will have to be submitted for approval by the ministry in the second part of 2010. The outcome of the IOB and PWC evaluations will provide important feedback, lessons learned and recommendations to be taken into account.

Ingrid van Engelshoven
Chair, D66 (Democrats 66)

Why we support NIMD
Strengthening democracy and democratic development are pre-eminently subjects which D66 strongly supports and this is why our party has been involved with NIMD since its inception. By facilitating political dialogue and strengthening a transparent and open political system with independent parties, politicians in NIMD programme countries are encouraged to be more accountable to their citizens. The work and the mission of NIMD link up perfectly with the social-liberal vision of D66. With this, people occupy centre stage within a society where freedom and equality are guaranteed, and the government’s role is that of serving its citizens. So, not surprisingly, D66 will steadfastly continue to strive for the reinforcement of the democratic constitutional state and good government in the Netherlands and throughout the world.
In Malawi, radio plays an important role in politics and society. While only seven percent of the population have access to electricity, almost two thirds of Malawians own or have access to a radio. People are hungry for information.

As the events in Kenya following the disputed 2007 elections showed, however, radio can also be misused for political purposes. There, political parties used FM radio stations to broadcast hate speeches and vilify opponents, declare ‘no-go zones’ and encourage supporters to attack their rivals.

Within this context, a catchy radio jingle exhorting the voters of Malawi to ‘be responsible’, to ‘get to know your political parties’ had special significance. The jingle, which was played on a private radio station in the lead-up to Malawi’s 2009 presidential and parliamentary elections, also neatly encapsulates the philosophy of Malawi’s Centre for Multiparty Democracy (CMD-M).

Lead-up to the 2009 elections
The post-election violence that rocked Kenya sent shockwaves throughout the region. It was for this reason that CMD-M organised a field visit to Kenya in January 2009 for representatives of Malawi’s political parties, in order to appreciate first hand what went wrong in 2008, and how this might be avoided in Malawi in 2009.

Francis Mphepo, Deputy Secretary General of the ruling Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) and the head of the Malawi delegation, said as much at the beginning of the visit: “We want to find out what was the cause of the crisis, and how they resolved the crisis. The reason we want to learn is that we are holding our elections in Malawi next year and we want to learn so that what happened here does not happen in Malawi.”
This attitude was echoed by Wakunda Kamanga, National Campaign Director of the DPP: “We have to do all we can to make sure that the Kenya scenario is not repeated here. And as political parties we therefore agreed that we must come up with a communiqué, where every party agreed, to make sure we are committed to a peaceful election.”

For its part, the CMD-M was also aware of the need to find a variety of ways to limit the potential for violence and thus commissioned a second radio jingle, entitled ‘Ziwawa’, encouraging people to remain calm throughout the night of Malawi’s general elections.

However Malawi’s politicians continue to face another problem: the attitude of ordinary citizens towards their political parties. In March 2008 Justice Anastazia Msosa, a Justice of the Supreme Court of Appeal who chairs the Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC), told a gathering of African politicians: “The mistrust that the general public has in political parties must be reversed!”

The role of the Malawi Electoral Commission

According to the Executive Director of CMD-M, Kizito Tenthani, the MEC itself also needed to be improved. “From that visit [to Kenya], what we referred to as an important lesson [was] the importance of having a credible electoral commission and we went back home to try to enhance the credibility of our electoral commission and to improve the trust the political parties had in the electoral commission in Malawi.”

Political parties’ trust in the MEC was crucial to the smooth running of the election, including the avoidance of political violence in the post-election period. CMD-M therefore organised a series of meetings with the political parties and other electoral stakeholders, including the MEC, encouraging them to achieve agreement on conflict prevention procedures.

Khwauli Msiska, the sole Alliance for Democracy (AFORD) MP elected to the current Malawian parliament, stressed the importance of these meetings:

“CMD-M managed to organise a number of meetings with the electoral commission in our country and through those meetings we managed to push through some of our suggestions which were taken on board. In that way my party felt safe and protected, and hence we managed to contribute towards peaceful elections in Malawi.”

The role of the media in Malawi

While the media in Malawi is ostensibly free, few would disagree that the power of the major protagonists to use the public media for their own gains cast a shadow over the lead-up to polling day. This was acknowledged in the final report of the EU
monitoring group sent to observe the elections:

“…the state-owned media in particular failed to fulfil even their minimum obligations as publicly-owned broadcasters as their coverage lacked any degree of balance and was openly biased in favour of the DPP. The election coverage of Joy FM was also similarly biased in favour of the United Democratic Front (UDF) and Malawi Congress Party (MCP).”

Further complicating matters, in demonstrating the fragility of the media in Malawi, the opposition-friendly Joy FM was actually shut down on election day, and several of its announcers arrested, after it broadcast a satirical skit directed at the DPP, in apparent contravention of the MEC’s media rules governing the election period.

The EU report went on to single out “the private radio stations – Capital and Zodiac Broadcasting Station – [which] provided impartial and balanced coverage of the political parties contesting the elections as did the newspapers.”

One of the reasons for the “impartial and balanced” coverage provided by these private radio stations was CMD-M’s decision to purchase airtime on Zodiac for the purpose of providing all parties with an opportunity to communicate their election platforms.

Therefore the radio programmes helped raise the public profile of political parties. According to Khwauli Msiska, “we were able in this particular project to package our message through the radio of our choice and we effectively communicated our message, including issues emanating from our revised manifesto, to the general public.”

**Looking to the future**

President Bingu wa Mutharika and his DPP Party won the elections comfortably, gaining a two-thirds majority of parliamentary seats in the process. The elections themselves, according to the EU monitors, while “not without blemish” were judged to be overall free and fair.

As the DPP’s Wakunda Kamanga points out, “You know under the Banda regime, which was a dictatorial regime, it was commonly said that democracy or multi-party democracy is war, and some people believed it. But we said to the people, ‘No, democracy is development, your own development. You will decide what must be done in your communities and you will be able to speak freely about anything that affects you.’”

Despite this optimism significant obstacles remain, including the issue of party financing and the thorny issues of the President’s stranglehold over the public media and the need for a more independent electoral commission.

Nevertheless, the inclusive efforts of organisations like the CMD-M have meant that the political culture in Malawi is changing, if slowly. Stay tuned for further developments.

For programme news and information, see: www.nimd.org/programme/malawi

---

**Henk Nijhof**

Chair, GroenLinks (Green Left Party)

**Why we support NIMD**

Democracy is very dear to GroenLinks. Freedom to choose, freedom of speech and freedom to develop are essential principles for GroenLinks, and in this context democracy is a key concept. These fundamental rights are best guaranteed in a democracy, and political organisations form an indispensible link.

Given our political beliefs the support of democratisation is both logical and necessary – precisely now that worldwide democracy appears to be undergoing a setback. To quote William Hastie: “Democracy is not being, it is becoming. It is easily lost, but never finally won.” GroenLinks will willingly fight hard for what is vulnerable and supports organisations such as NIMD that are dedicated to this cause.
One of the first countries in Sub-Saharan Africa to achieve independence, in 1957, Ghana has become a ‘beacon of hope’ for other African countries under colonial rule. Today, the successful consolidation of multiparty democracy in Ghana is proving that democracy can work in Africa.

This level of democratic development has not come about without hard work and its further consolidation will require continued concerted effort.

Since 2003, the main vehicle for democratic reform in Ghana has been the Ghana Political Parties Programme (GPPP), a programme supported by NIMD and the Accra-based Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA).

The programme, which includes the four Ghanaian political parties with representation in Parliament, recognises that political parties have a special responsibility to ensure that the political process transpires peacefully and in accordance with the constitutional provisions.

Since its inception the programme has supported a variety of activities, developed a code of conduct for political parties, and produced a shared agenda for democratic reforms, the Democracy Consolidation Strategy Paper (DCSP).

The paper offers both a comprehensive review of the state of Democracy in Ghana and a roadmap on how to enhance its performance.

Important lessons have been learnt in the cooperation between the Ghanaian political parties and NIMD. The partnership has motivated the political parties to commit to inter-party cooperation and has led to them taking a pro-active role in addressing issues of national concern in Ghana, while also gradually reforming the political institutions and culture with the intention of entrenching pluralistic democracy and the rule of law.

The programme has also become another Ghanaian ‘export-article’. The political leaders of the four parliamentary parties are now actively engaged in sharing their experiences with political leaders in other African countries at loggerheads with each other or worse.

For its part, NIMD has evolved in its role as a privileged long-term partner. NIMD has facilitated dialogue, shared its knowledge on democratic reform processes, provided networking platforms and technical assistance on specific agenda items and, finally, acted as a broker between Ghana and international partners to ensure their support for the democratic reform agenda outlined in the DCSP.

The results achieved through this cooperation demonstrate, to quote President Mills’ recent State of the Nation address, “what genuine reconciliation and collaboration, based on a spirit of Wanting-To-Work-Together, can achieve” in consolidating democracy.

For programme news and information, see: www.nimd.org/programme/ghana

President Mills of Ghana
February 2010

“I am sitting in this chair because all political parties in Ghana have embraced democracy. And indeed we have a standard to maintain. Everyone is looking to us because they think we are trailblazers. And I have no doubt that with the kind of cooperation and collaboration that is being forged by the various political parties there is nothing that we cannot do.”

– President John Mills of Ghana, commenting on the NIMD-sponsored Political Parties Programme.
1) Discussion in the corridors of the conference location

2) Participants read the conference news bulletin

3) Kathleen Ferrier, member of Parliament for the Christian Democratic Party, explains the state of development cooperation in the Netherlands.

4) Deputy Prime Minister of Zimbabwe Thokozani Khuphe delivers an address on the situation in her country

5) Doris Cruz from Guatemala welcomed by Njeri Kabeberi from Kenya, and Roel von Meijenfeld welcome Hippo Stephen Twebaze from Uganda

6) Lem van Eupen, Director of Radio Netherlands Training Centre (RNTC)

7) Anitá Lie from Indonesia presenting the Democracy School to other participants

8) Mr. Johnson Asiedu Nketia, General Secretary of the National Democratic Congress (NDC) indicates how proud he is of the smooth political transition after the elections in Ghana.

9) Group photo NIMD Partnership Days 2009

10) Malian delegation meets with NIMD President Bernard Bot

11) Mozambican politicians Gania Aly Abdula Mussavy, Manhica (RENAMO) and Xarzada Selemane Hassané Ora (FRELIMO) side by side giving a presentation
12] Documenting democracy stories, the NIMD film crew interviews delegation members from Indonesia and Suriname.

13] Silvia Lazarte, ex-President of the Constitutional Assembly (MAS), and José Antonio Aruquipa (Podemos) explaining the political situation in Bolivia to Kenyan Vice President Stephen Kalonzo Musyoka.
NIMD’s Indonesia Elections Blog

In the lead-up to the 2009 Indonesian Presidential and Parliamentary elections, NIMD hosted a blog on its website featuring articles, interviews, stories and observations on the election campaign written by local reporters and graduates of the NIMD-supported Democracy Schools programme in Melang, East Java.

Visit http://blogs.nimd.org/indonesia-elections to read the full texts.

The Democracy School: education for a new generation of politicians

In Indonesia, NIMD supports local Democracy Schools where young politicians, social activists, and professionals are trained in democratic values and practices. The schools offer a unique venue to involve citizens in local politics, foster a new generation of democratic politicians, and deepen Indonesian democracy. Since 2004, Democracy Schools have been set up in five provinces. More than 500 students have successfully completed the one-year course. About 100 of those participated this year in the elections as legislative candidates. The Democracy Schools are an initiative of the Jakarta-based Indonesian Community for Democracy (KID) with support from NIMD. In 2010 KID is planning to expand the number of schools it runs from five to ten.

On the Campaign Trail in Malang

25 March 2009

Election campaigns are not always about mobilising people at rallies and speaking on stage. Syahrrotsa Rahmania, a candidate for the National Awakening Party (PKB) in Malang, East Java, and an alumni of the NIMD-supported Democracy School, has her own way of campaigning.

Rosania, as she calls herself, uses a typical way to introduce herself to the people in Jodipan. She walks around the village with brochures that contain her missions and visions if she is elected in the upcoming elections. In her campaign, Rosania also brings bath soap to her audiences. For Rosania, bath soap is a symbol that she is a clean and accountable politician…

For her, this is also a fair and democratic way of campaigning because the voters and the candidates can meet each other directly. People can express what they feel to the candidates if they are elected. A local resident of Jodipan, Siyami (52) is very happy to have a chance to talk face to face with the candidate. “It shows that she cares about us,” says Siyami.

By Any Rufaidah and Alim Mustofa
Banner Business Thrives in Campaign Season
1 April 2009

For some, election campaigns may seem boring or even bothersome. Outdoor rallies cause traffic jams, and thousands of posters and banners are posted all over the city. But for those in the banner business, the campaign season is exciting – and profitable. They get orders in large volumes.

On a nice day for a stroll in the city of Malang, I walked from Achmad Yani Utara Street in the crowded north side of the city, to Polowijen Gang 2 street. It is the place where Iwan runs his banner business. People in Malang know the building as the ‘antique building’. After knocking at the west gate, an officer of the factory, Indra Susanto (25), came out to open the door.

Indra told me that they have been receiving a lot of orders for posters, banners, and other campaign material from political parties in Malang. “Since last December the orders have started to accumulate,” says Indra. The orders continued to rise through January 2009 when the campaign season started and the factory was producing at full capacity.

Walking around the factory, Indra explained that to meet the demand, they had to ask employees to work overtime. Only in the last couple of weeks before the election day did demand drop. Now they don’t have any more orders from political parties, they have resumed taking orders from their regular customers.

By Alim Mustofa

Lembata’s political market place
3 April 2009

Just a week before the elections in 2004, Lembata’s market went up in flames. The fire forced hundreds of sellers to leave the location. They lost many rupiahs due to the accident. A director of a local NGO, Bibiana Riang Hepat, who was involved in efforts to help the sellers at that time, says the cause of the fire is still a mystery.

Now, thousands of people crowd the former market place once again. But they are not there for business. They come to attend the campaign rallies organised by political parties in the run-up to the elections on 9 April. Political parties from nearby areas such as Lewoleba village and Selandoro village always use the place for mass gatherings. Yohanes Boro, a legislative candidate of the National People’s Concern Party (PPRN) says this place is ideal for political campaigns because it is centrally located. Aries Nimanuho, a legislative candidate for the Democratic Party, confirms this. Their campaigns have attracted many sellers who are making a comeback because of the elections.

A number of vegetable and fish sellers are open until twilight even though this is illegal. And not unlike these sellers, the political parties ‘sell’ their programme here. From their campaign stalls at the traditional market, they solicit for the vote of Lembata’s residents.

By Alexander Taum

Personalised politics remain dominant
April 22, 2009

Indonesia’s legislative elections took place in all but two districts, in Indonesia, on 9 April 2009. The districts of East Flores and Lembata in the province of East Nusa Tenggara were allowed to postpone polling until 14 April 2009 so that traditional Catholic Holy Week celebrations were not interrupted.

The results of the election are known to the public, despite many complaints and objections brought forward by people who were denied the right to vote for administrative reasons. The overall winner of the legislative election was the Democrat Party, which is the party of the current President. It was founded in September 2001 and in eight years it has grown to become the most influential party – able to beat other more experienced parties such as the Golkar Party and the (once brave) Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P)…

Anyone can see that political parties which do nothing for their constituents will be punished during elections according to their sin of omission. In contrast to that, a young political party that happens to have a political figure with limited reasons to be blamed for obvious wrongdoings tends to attract more followers…

By Ignas Kleden, sociologist and chairman of the KID.
iLEDA School:  
Training a new generation of political leaders in Mozambique

Ivo Opstelten  
Chair, VVD (People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy)  

Why we support NIMD  
Multi-party democracies, anywhere in the world, form the backbone of a working constitutional state. The joint supervision of political parties prevents governments from growing to such an extent that they take on too large a form, or that the rights of minorities are ignored by the simple majority. But for that task, the parties must have something to offer. They learn this the best while actually doing the job – from parties and politicians who know all the tricks of the trade and contribute their experience from elsewhere. Moreover, the exchange of knowledge broadens the parties’ field of vision, because national politics can sometimes all too easily lose sight of the outside world. This was why, in 2000, the VVD became the leading force in the creation of NIMD. Ever since, through the efforts of many VVD politicians in the countries where NIMD is active, my party has contributed to strengthening the parties and making the multi-party systems more robust. Promoting freedom, from South Africa to Indonesia and Guatemala.

iLEDA is a democracy training programme for political and civic leaders from across Africa, established in 2009 by NIMD, IDASA and the Africa Forum.

Through the programme, community leaders learn how to actively take part in politics and engage with local politicians and councillors, in order to effectively address issues that are relevant to their communities.

This reflects iLEDA’s mission, which is “to strengthen democracy in Africa by preparing a new generation of civic and political leaders to be effective agents of change.”

iLEDA offers three programmes: the Political Leadership Programme (iLEDA Academy), the Citizen Leadership Programme (iLEDA School) and tailor-made consulting services (iLEDA Consulting) on training and leadership development.

In February 2010, a graduation ceremony was held in Chimoio, Mozambique for the first graduates of the iLEDA School. In total five trainers and twenty one citizen leaders received a certificate.

In 2010, iLEDA will continue with the citizen leadership training programme, making use of the first five Mozambican graduate trainers. The expectation is that the training will also involve local political parties, as well as provincial and local assemblies.

One of the lessons learned from the NIMD-assisted Democracy Schools programme in Indonesia is that political education helps enable a new generation to bridge divides between politics and society.

It is encouraging that a similar approach is being initiated in Mozambique. The focus on teaching potential leaders in the practical application of democratic instruments complements efforts to achieve institutional reforms.
State of Democracy Bolivia

Since 2006, when Evo Morales of the Movimiento al Socialismo (MAS) became President, Bolivia has witnessed political turbulence and social unrest but also rising hope for more justice and equality for the indigenous population. Due to the rise of the MAS, the traditional parties have lost their grip on the political system. Mr. Morales came to power with an agenda of reform, including a new constitution, to give excluded population groups a voice in the political process.

Constitution

As the MAS clashed with the dethroned political establishment, the constitution-making process led to political confrontation and violence until, in October 2008, the government and the opposition came to an agreement on the text of the new constitution. In January 2009, the constitution was approved by a referendum.

Electoral Law

The new constitution focuses on issues of regional autonomy, the distribution of national resources and the balance of power. In light of the latter, a new Electoral Law was proposed in 2009. After weeks of disagreement in the Plurinational Assembly and the Senate, parliament passed a new Electoral Law in April, which was immediately signed by President Morales. A certain number of seats (less than proposed by the MAS but more than the opposition desired) is now reserved for the indigenous candidates. Also, women and men are to be represented equally in the list of candidates.

Elections and prognosis

Political life in Bolivia has been strongly defined by the national elections held on 6 December 2009, which took place without the kind of violent confrontations witnessed in previous years. Mr. Morales increased his electoral support to 64%, up from 54% of the votes in 2005. Moreover, the results also show that support for Morales grew in regions where opposition to the MAS is strong, such as in Santa Cruz and Tarija. Now that the MAS enjoys a two-thirds majority in both the Plurinational Assembly and the Senate, it will face no difficulties in having its proposals approved. Local elections for the Departments and Municipalities will be held on 4 April 2010. On both levels, people will directly vote for the head of the Executive and for the Assembly. After these elections, a clear picture of the political landscape for the coming five years will be defined.

Autonomous regions

A major issue in Bolivia is the political tension within and between the different regions, especially in the provinces of Santa Cruz and Tarija. On the one hand the central government has to count on the support of all the departments in order to implement public policies. On the other hand, each departmental government has to represent the interests of its citizens, which vary greatly in Bolivia, due to social economic diversity per region.
NIMD Bolivia Programme
NIMD has been working in Bolivia since 2002. NIMD’s partner in the country is the Fundación Boliviana para la Democracia Multipartidaria (fBDM). The general objective of the programme is to promote and support change in Bolivia’s political culture – from confrontation to dialogue. fBDM approaches this by promoting dialogue between all political parties and movements in fBDM itself as well as by including disenfranchised groups in the political process. The programme also aims to strengthen the relationship between political parties, movements and citizens.

Electoral Law
During 2009, an important achievement was the elaboration and approval of the new Electoral Law. In this process, fBDM supported the direct participation of civil society in systemising the different draft proposals for the law. Moreover, it facilitated a dialogue between the different political parties and movements in order to reach a compromise on the content of the law. Furthermore, in preparation for the national electoral, fBDM also made a contribution to communicating the electoral manifestos of all political organisations to the public by distributing inserts in the national newspaper and broadcasting radio programmes through Asbora, a network of sixty radio stations.

Parties and Movements
Traditional political parties have lost their credentials and new parties and political movements have been formed. It is very important that these new political entities build their organisations in a transparent way. Party members should be able to hold their representatives in the Plurinational Assembly accountable. Politicians may need training to develop party programmes and draft proposals for reform. Institutional and programmatic strengthening of political parties and movements are therefore key focus areas of NIMD’s programme in Bolivia.

Autonomous Regions
NIMD’s programme has expanded to the regional level, in order to act upon the different political voices particular to the regions. Much effort is being put into promoting political dialogue, so that confrontation and potentially separatism can be avoided. Towards this end, fBDM has now founded sub-offices in Santa Cruz and Tarija.

In 2009 fBDM played a major role in achieving multiparty consensus for the Electoral Law, just as it did in 2008, when the foundation helped the government and the opposition achieve agreement on the text of the new Bolivian Constitution. fBDM was able to contribute to these agreements by bringing together moderates from both sides (government and opposition) and facilitating a process of consensus building.

Stakeholders
1. Programme Partner
Fundación Boliviana para la Democracia Multipartidaria (fBDM)

2. Key national partners
- Corte Nacional Electoral (CNE, National Electoral Council)
- Asociación Boliviana de Radiodifusoras (ASBORA, radio stations organisation)
- Universidad Nacional

3. Key international partners
- Royal Netherlands Embassy
- International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA)
- Friedrich Ebert Stiftung – Instituto Latinoamericano de Investigaciones Sociales (FES–ILDIS)
- Andres Bello International Institute
- European Union (EU)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF)

Contact person for this programme:
Eliane Faerstein, Policy Officer Latin America, elianefaerstein@nimd.org
A constitutional reform process for all Zimbabweans

By Marieke van Doorn, European Partnership for Democracy (EPD)

In Zimbabwe, a constitutional reform process has been initiated to restore democratic governance and establish new institutions that would allow for free and fair elections. Marieke van Doorn, Senior Programme Coordinator for the Secretariat of the European Partnership for Democracy (EPD) in Brussels, discusses recent events in Zimbabwe, and explains what her organisation has been doing to promote democracy.

A classic liberator’s dilemma

The current political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe is the direct result of over a decade of increasingly authoritarian governance. A failed constitutional reform process in the late 1990s, culminating in the ‘no’ vote in the referendum in 2000, marked the beginning of a deepening political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe. This reform process failed primarily because Zimbabweans did not feel that the draft Constitution adequately reflected their views.

At the same time President Mugabe’s military liberation movement turned political party, the Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF), was faced for the first time since independence with an oppositional force in the political arena, the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), founded in 1999 by trade union leader Morgan Tsvangirai. The people’s ‘no’ vote in the Constitutional referendum as well as the growing power of the opposition has led the ZANU-PF regime to resort to increasingly unorthodox means to stay in power, including rigging of election results, electoral violence, intimidation and limiting press freedom.

To summarise, even after having lost the last three elections (most recently in 2008), ZANU-PF shows no inclination to hand over power in a peaceful way. The party rationalises its clinging-on to power by referring to a classic liberator’s dilemma, declaring all opposition unpatriotic and neo-colonial.

In reality the Zimbabwean political system of winner-takes-all, inherited from its former
British colonisers, simply does not allow Mugabe and colleagues to hand over power for they have too much to lose in terms of economic privileges, not to mention the threat of possible prosecution by an international court. To mitigate the challenges of a transition of power, a negotiated route to a power-sharing deal between ZANU-PF and MDC was brokered by South Africa on behalf of the South African Development Community (SADC), culminating in the signing of the Global Political Agreement (GPA) in September 2008.

The signing of the power-sharing deal resulted in an Inclusive Government taking office in February 2009. Relative peace returned to Zimbabwe, with a decrease in violence. The ‘dollarisation’ of the economy ended the world-record inflation, allowing business to pick up and providing for food on the shelves again. A constitutional reform process was initiated to restore democratic governance in Zimbabwe and establish new institutions that would allow for free and fair elections.

World Championship

However the constitutional process is only slowly moving ahead and with the prospect of new elections, Zimbabwe is again experiencing an increase in the number of violent incidents.

“We know where to find you after the World Championship”, is the current threat being issued to democracy activists in certain rural areas, referring to the moment when the eyes of the world turn away from the region at the conclusion of the 2010 Soccer World Cup in South Africa.

The EPD started out with a project to assist victims of political violence and will continue this project during 2010 with the generous support of the Dutch Postcode Lottery. It allows for assistance to people who have paid the price for democracy by losing their husbands, fathers and sons in the targeted violence carried out by youth militia, the army and police that are still under ZANU-PF control.

Since the implementation of the power-sharing deal, EPD has focused on supporting the interface between the new Inclusive Government and civil society. The deal is far from perfect, but provides an opportunity once more to reform the ‘Lancaster House’ Constitution which has been in place since independence from the UK in 1980 and which has now been amended 18 times, mainly for the purpose of extending executive powers.

There are now fears that the consultation process for a new constitution will be both rushed and politicised and will fail to engage the Zimbabwean public in a substantive manner. This would threaten the people-driven nature of the process as stipulated in the GPA, which acknowledges the fundamental right and duty of the Zimbabwean people to make a constitution by and for themselves. In short, the process of making this constitution must be owned and driven by the Zimbabwean people and must be inclusive and democratic.

Supporting a people-driven constitutional reform process

The EPD focuses with a group of Zimbabwean NGOs on meeting the urgent need to supply impartial information to the Zimbabwean people about the constitutional process to ensure their meaningful participation, and allow them to make their own choices to be reflected in the new constitution. As has already been mentioned, the current political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe is the direct result of over a decade of increasingly authoritarian governance, which affect the lives of Zimbabwean citizens on a daily basis.

Zimbabweans are generally very engaged with and well informed about the ongoing political transition. Zimbabwe is truly a country with 12 million political analysts. EPD and its partners work to further empower the Zimbabwean public in expressing their own needs and making their own choices by strengthening civil society coordination of activities in support of the Constitutional reform process. EPD aims to achieve:

- Sufficient civic education meetings across Zimbabwe and materials to inform Zimbabweans, so that they can participate meaningfully in the constitutional reform process;
- Strengthened synergies between the Parliament-led process and the people’s input to the process;
- Efficient advocacy strategies to mobilise Zimbabwean citizens to participate; and
- An enrichment of the quality of debate as well as the contents of the constitutional reform process by sharing international best practices and providing a safe platform to discuss contentious issues.

While EPD’s Zimbabwean partners are already working to achieve these results, they face a number of challenges. One of these challenges is the prevailing funding environment. Most Zimbabwean organisations recognise that the global financial and economic crisis has led to diminished funding levels. This makes it important for Zimbabwean organisations to coordinate their activities closely and avoid duplication of efforts. Another challenge is that, despite the fact that these organisations are making attempts to coordinate their activities, more can be done to ensure that consistent messages are delivered to the Zimbabwean public. By investing in effective coordination, EPD will ensure that scarce funds are utilised as efficiently as possible.

By signing the GPA, the leaders of the rival political parties showed they were mindful of the need to ensure that the new constitution deepens Zimbabwe’s democratic values, principles and the protection of the equality of all citizens. The Inclusive Government, however, is faced with a severe lack of resources and technical capacity to implement the goals outlined in the GPA, as is the Parliament of Zimbabwe. The Ministry of Constitutional and Parliamentary Affairs, charged with the facilitation of the constitutional process, is keenly aware that the participation of the Zimbabwean people in the process is essential for restoring legitimate governance in Zimbabwe, but lacks the means to facilitate
meetings and disseminate sufficient information to include the public throughout the country.

Politics meets civil society: EPD and NIMD’s work in Zimbabwe

EPD is a network of European organisations that strengthen democratisation processes world-wide. It was established in order to express more clearly European solidarity with the men and women fighting for democracy in their own countries, and in recognition of the fact that Europe’s peace and prosperity is based on democracy. The recent transitions to democracy in Eastern Europe and Southern EU Member States provide for a plethora of experience in this field. In its support programmes, EPD is therefore using the best available knowledge from the European continent to assist our partners oversees in the best possible way. NIMD is a founding partner of the EPD.

With both MDC and ZANU-PF in the Inclusive Government, Zimbabwe has lost a political opposition in parliament performing the democratic oversight role. Civil society can play a key role in informing the Zimbabwean public about the process to ensure they can engage with the government/parliament’s constitutional interlocutors. With so much power concentrated in the all-party government, the EPD focuses on strengthening civil society organisations to redefine their roles as a countervailing power in the country.

The EPD activities perfectly complement the important work that NIMD is supporting with regard to the inter-party dialogue in Zimbabwe. The NIMD experience in facilitating democratic progress on a political level is a sine qua non for the transition process in the Zimbabwean context where politicians are clearly to be blamed for the current problems in the country.

At the same time politicians are the actors who need to find a peaceful resolution to overcome the conflict and restore the conditions for democratic governance in Zimbabwe. For this reason, NIMD and EPD will systematically seek to support meetings between the political actors on one hand and civil society on the other, with a view to working towards a peaceful and democratic Zimbabwe.

Citizens suffer as the economic crisis affects daily life in Harare
Democracy has its price

Elma Karimazondo and her husband Sheppard Jani were running their shop in Murehwa in Zimbabwe. Simultaneously their shop served as a safe haven for victims of political violence during the elections of 2008. Harassed democracy activists sought shelter, food and medical aid which Elma and Sheppard Jani provided as often as they could. Soon though, Mr. Jani became a victim himself. Armed men dragged him out of their store and Elma never saw her husband alive again. She had to flee the village with their two children.

EPD’s project supporting victims of political violence in Zimbabwe has helped Elma and 600 other activists and widows who have paid an extremely high price for standing up for democratic change in their country. It provided for safe housing, medical and legal aid and a job to generate income for their family after losing their husbands.

After a relatively quiet time, incidents of political violence are on the rise again and are expected to rise even further in the run up to a referendum on the Constitution and Elections. “We know where to find you after the World Championship”, is the current threat being issued to democracy activists in certain rural areas, referring to the moment when the eyes of the world turn away from the region at the conclusion of the 2010 Soccer World Cup in South Africa.

Don’t turn your eyes away – support aid to democracy activists in Zimbabwe.

For information on how to donate, please see: www.epd.eu/support-epd

Lilianne Ploumen
Chair, PvdA (Dutch Labour Party)

Why we support NIMD

Everybody counts, both within and outside the Dutch borders. The social democratic Labour Party (PvdA) advocates and cherishes international solidarity with the underprivileged. For the Netherlands this means fair and coherent foreign policy and effective development cooperation.

However, creating opportunities for the underprivileged does not solely depend on the international setting. The governments of developing countries and young democracies obviously play a very decisive role as well. Political parties play a critical role in holding these governments accountable, but in many young democracies political parties are struggling to fulfill that task. For this reason the PvdA, together with six other Dutch parties, founded NIMD in 2000.

NIMD inspires and stimulates political parties in sixteen young democracies to “engage in a fruitful dialogue” and to improve their performance. This is an important contribution to democratisation worldwide that will ultimately change for the better the living conditions of the disadvantaged.
Peter van Heeswijk
Chair, CDA (Christian Democratic Party)

**Why we support NIMD**
Who could fail to remember those images of Nelson Mandela who, after such a long period of imprisonment, walked out a free man. Decades earlier, when he was put on trial and faced the possibility of being sentenced to death he said, “I cherish the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all people live together in harmony and have equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live and see, but one which I am prepared to die for.”

The CDA supports people, civil social organisations and political parties that are dedicated to improving their democracy. People who, in difficult circumstances, assume responsibility for helping their country to move forward. We do this via the Eduardo Frei Stichting but also within NIMD. And we do this because it is precisely in democracies that human rights flourish, that socially-responsible policies are more effectively promoted than in dictatorships, and people are given the opportunity to develop their own lives. Worldwide, eight out of ten people see democracy as the best political system.

But it is also to the advantage of the Netherlands. We donate substantial sums of money to development cooperation. From the perspective of public support, it is also necessary that this money is well spent. Research has shown that politics in many developing countries are often an obstacle to development. Political reform is required before Mandela’s ideal can become possible. A society in which people have equal opportunities to develop, and where they take responsibility accordingly. NIMD’s efforts towards this goal are laudable.

---

**EU policy on democracy support**

**Council of the European Union provides agenda for action**

On 17 November 2009, the Council of the European Union agreed to adopt the Council Conclusions on Democracy Support in the EU’s External Affairs. NIMD has actively contributed to the preparation of this new EU policy framework.

The new policy on democracy support comes at a moment in which EU foreign policy is taking a step forward. The Lisbon Treaty, which came into force on 1 December 2009, is now being implemented. Under the new Treaty, the European Action Service (EAS) will be created: the new EU foreign office, which is headed by Baroness Catherine Ashton, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and Vice-President of the European Commission. The Council Conclusions provide an Agenda for Action for EAS to implement the new policy on democracy support.

**Why the need for these Conclusions?**
Democracy is one of Europe’s core values and one of the principal criteria, agreed upon in Copenhagen in 1993, that candidate countries must fulfil to become members of the EU. Yet thus far there have been no explicit statement of the EU’s commitment to supporting democracy in its interactions with the rest of the world.

These Council Conclusions are changing that. Furthermore, the Council Conclusions will serve a very practical purpose. As they try to bring together the nineteen different initiatives (and instruments) of EU development or foreign policy that support democracy and human rights into a single, more coherent approach, the Conclusions pursue a more effective and efficient use of EU citizens’ money.

**NIMD’s contribution**
NIMD has actively contributed to the preparation of this new EU policy framework. In July 2004, at the beginning of the Dutch EU Presidency, NIMD convened a conference in The Hague on the theme of Enhancing the European Profile in Democracy Assistance. The conference resulted in the The Hague Statement, which contained many elements that have now been included in the new EU policy on democracy support.

---

**President Álvaro Colom of Guatemala**

October 2009

“Definitely NIMD has made, I would say, a substantive contribution to the advancement of democracy and political participation. The Forum of Political Parties opened the necessary space, facilitating discussion among the parties to permit change to occur in harmony, and in a peaceful way. Those meetings at the time were really powerful. The support provided by NIMD and by the people who facilitated the dialogue has been a great help.”

— President Álvaro Colom commenting on the work of NIMD in Guatemala
Democratic governance still faces great challenges in many countries within the Latin American region. Political institutions remain weak and governments change frequently. Ecuador is no exception: recently it has undergone a period of profound constitutional reform, the centrepiece of which is the country’s twentieth constitution. Along with this new constitution, president Rafael Correa has introduced new forms of direct democracy.

Democracy and the Media
A well balanced relationship between political society and the media can be productive when a society is asked to be more participatory within the democratic process. The media plays a crucial role, especially when it comes to civil participation in politics and the accountability of political actors, including government and parliament.

Engaging the media in raising awareness of Ecuador’s new constitution has proved to be a challenging but rewarding task for NIMD’s partner in Ecuador, Ágora Democrática (IDEA-NIMD), which started its work in 2006, the year that Rafael Correa was elected as President for the first time. During the Constitutional Assembly, Ágora supported a weekly radio programme, called ‘Ágora Constituyente’, which was broadcast directly from the Assembly. With this initiative, Ágora created an alternative communication channel between politics and
citizens. More recently, together with the same network of community radio stations (CORAPE), Ágora has used the power of the media to reach out to rural and remote communities and explain the constitutional reforms. This project, known as “The Constitution in Practice”, is partly supported by the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Ecuador’s New Constitution
With the approval of the new constitution in 2008, the citizens of Ecuador agreed to a more participatory form of democracy. In addition to the three usual state powers – Executive, Legislative and Judicial – a new institution was introduced: the Transparency and Social Control Body, in which citizens are able to participate directly. Members of the Body will be selected by way of a competition and will have the power to appoint and control other state authorities. The constitution also sets out a framework for civil participation at the local government level.

However, citizens remain largely unaware of the consequences of the new constitution and how the institutions will function in practice. Right after the Constitutional Assembly in 2008, Ágora Democrática, together with some local NGOs, organised a series of workshops to find out the expectations of civil society regarding the Assembly. According to Cristhian Parreño of Ágora Democrática, “one of the lessons learned was the lack of knowledge amongst Ecuadorians of the constitution, their rights and obligations. It was therefore proposed to carry out a public awareness campaign.”

Awareness Campaign
This campaign was comprised of several elements, including a series of radio broadcasts and newspaper inserts explaining the rights and obligations of Ecuadorian citizens, and a number of decentralised workshops for journalists, civil society organisations, local politicians and citizens.

A total of twelve inserts were published and distributed with the El Comercio newspaper. The content of the twelve bulletins included explanations of Ecuadorians’ constitutional rights and responsibilities; of the State Functions; and of the meaning of ‘El Buen Vivir’, or ‘wellbeing’.

“In terms of content, Ecuador’s new constitution is probably one of the most advanced in South America. The challenge for the country was to build a culture of dialogue and consensus, and to create a constitution in which all sectors of society feel represented. This avoids the possibility that a future government will create its own constitution,” says Parreño.

Outreach material prepared by NIMD-partner Ágora Democrática
The distribution of the bulletins covered the main cities of all 24 provinces, but bulletins were also delivered through CORAPE radio networks to small towns and communities in order to reach rural areas. The bulletins have also been used in the radio broadcasts and workshops as support material for the discussion because of their contents and working proposals.

In 2010, four more workshops are planned, including one that has been organised in response to a request from an indigenous group, the Shuar, and which will be held in the province of Morona Santiago with Shuar communities. Some of these people have never left their communities and have never had their constitutional rights explained to them.

For Mario Villalobos, CORAPE’s news coordinator, who facilitated two of the workshops in 2009, the project was important, “because it reflected an open and democratic discussion on the citizens’ views regarding their participation needs, the ways to accomplish it, and the public demands for political spaces to incorporate the new concepts of the constitution.”

Margarita Arias, a citizen who works for a migrants’ organisation, says it is important that the new constitution “is inclusive – that it guarantees the people’s human, participation, and migration rights.”

She continues by observing that “as a workshop participant, one of the best experiences was the open debates on participation issues, helping the participants to learn about their rights and the fact that these are a demo-

---

Peter Blokhuis
Chair, CU (Christian Union Party)

Why we support NIMD
Last year I visited the NIMD office with a group of students from countries such as Hungary, Romania and Turkey. Two NIMD members of staff spoke about their vision of democracy and their work in countries where political parties have difficulty in functioning democratically. Afterwards, the students expressed their surprise at what they had heard. They were unaware that parties can also function differently from what they were accustomed to. It gave them a more positive outlook on understanding politics. I am convinced that the views of people can change, but it takes time. The work of NIMD is not a matter of swift successes. It is work that focuses on peace and tolerance. That is worth a great deal to us.
cratic tool. It was also valuable to build social networks between the participants and their social organisations.”

**Future Possibilities**

One of the results of the workshops is that civil society organisations have proposed various dialogues and discussion platforms, some of which may result in the institutionalisation of processes and platforms in the future. For example in Puyo, social organisations and the local radio station talked over the possibility of having a space where social and political actors could generate debates and meet on a regular basis.

Ágora has also had meetings with state organisations such as the Citizens Participation Council and the Ministry of Education, both of which have showed interest in generating spaces for dialogue where constitutional rights and obligations can be discussed. For example, the Citizens Participation Council has asked for Agora’s authorisation to place the PDFs of the bulletins on its web page. Moreover, Ágora, in cooperation with the Ministry of Education, is also planning to re-use the bulletins for a possible new project in 2010 in order to disseminate the content of the constitution among young people in specific regions. Finally, from 2010, CORAPE will continue the ‘Ágora Constituyente’ radio broadcasts without the financial support of Ágora Demócática because of their added value for its political programming. This is one of the most concrete and visible results of the Ágora project.

While the public awareness campaign has been very successful, as Mario Villalobos points out, much work remains to be done. “I think people have a greater knowledge of the constitution, but there is still much to do in order to say that they “know enough”. Being a legal instrument, it contains many concepts that must be explained and understood. The approval and dissemination of the constitution is part of the work that has to be done in order to build a new society.”

For programme news and information, see: www.nimd.org/programme/ecuador
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**Publications**

**Beyond Orthodox Approaches: Assessing Opportunities for Democracy Support in the Middle East and North Africa**
Publication of NIMD and Hivos. Includes case studies from Morocco, Egypt and Iran.

**Writing Autobiographies of Nations: a comparative analysis of constitutional reform processes**
Through case studies from Bolivia, Ecuador, Kenya, Zambia and Zimbabwe, this book examines how constitution-making can be inclusive and democratic.

**Democracy: testimonies of a work in progress**
This publication contains a collection of eight stories by NIMD partners who, in their own words, provide an account of the results that they have achieved with support from NIMD.

**NIMD Factsheet Series**
Concise programme information and political analysis on a single sheet. Currently available factsheets: Bolivia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Ecuador, Kenya, Suriname, and Uganda.

**NIMD in the Media**

**Uganda: Inter-Party Dialogue Learns From Ghana.** Article on NIMD-facilitated visit of Ugandan politicians to Ghana by Jude Kafuuma, published by allAfrica.com on 19 December.

**Without democracy no stability in Afghanistan.** Opinion article by NIMD President Bernard Bot and NIMD Executive Director Roel von Meijenfeldt on Afghanistan, published in newspaper NRC Handelsblad on 18 December.

**Indonesian honour for Bot and Van Baalen.** Report by the Netherlands Press Agency ANP on the honorary medals that NIMD President Bernard Bot and NIMD Advisory Council Chair Hans van Baalen received from the government of Indonesia on 9 October.

**On 24 August, the French radio service for Africa of Radio Netherlands Worldwide (RNW) interviewed NIMD Political Advisor (VVD) Sam van der Staak and Knowledge Officer Silvia Rottenberg in the biweekly program Afrique en Action.**

**On 12 August, NIMD Senior Policy Officer Will Derks was interviewed by Radio Netherlands Worldwide (RNW) in a program about the elections in Indonesia.**

**Address human rights in Iran.** Opinion article by NIMD Political Advisor (GroenLinks) Annie van der Pas published in newspaper Trouw on 6 August.

**‘Obama aims at cooperation’.** Opinion Article by NIMD Executive Director Roel von Meijenfeldt published in newspaper Trouw on 23 July.

**On 7 April NIMD Policy Advisor (VVD) Sam van der Staak was interviewed by the RTL 4 television program Editie NL about the elections in Afghanistan.**

**On 6 April, NIMD policy officer Will Derks featured in a broadcast in Indonesian of Radio Netherlands Worldwide (RNW) on the Legislative elections in Indonesia.**

**Democracy education for youth in Afghanistan.** Opinion article by NIMD President Bernard Bot on democratic development and education in Afghanistan, published on 30 March in Dutch newspaper De Volkskrant.

**On 7 March NIMD Executive Director Roel von Meijenfeldt was invited by NOS News, Radio 1 to comment on the tragic car accident in Zimbabwe that took the life of premier Morgan Tsvangirai’s wife.**
Statement of costs and revenue 2009 in €

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Revised budget 2009</th>
<th>Actuals 2009</th>
<th>Result 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO BE FUNDED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARP (African Regional Programmes)</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>350,204</td>
<td>612,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>505,732</td>
<td>609,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>651,448</td>
<td>648,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>431,732</td>
<td>512,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>584,169</td>
<td>556,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>306,667</td>
<td>159,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>401,788</td>
<td>503,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>182,997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>555,000</td>
<td>478,199</td>
<td>659,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>348,622</td>
<td>73,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Africa</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>4,786,000</td>
<td>137,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Asia and Latin America</strong></td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>81,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENRP (Eurasian &amp; NR Programme)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>348,000</td>
<td>275,218</td>
<td>181,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>112,941</td>
<td>183,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>763,000</td>
<td>697,790</td>
<td>3,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARP (Latin America Regional Programmes)</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>147,637</td>
<td>43,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>396,782</td>
<td>457,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>359,000</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>618,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>758,774</td>
<td>11,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,767</td>
<td>119,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>263,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Asia and Latin America</strong></td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>3,739,000</td>
<td>284,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings from underspent grants</strong></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership Days</strong></td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>121,757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total programmes</strong></td>
<td>8,600,000</td>
<td>421,450</td>
<td>7,735,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cutting activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing, Networking and Outreach</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>565,933</td>
<td>191,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of country programmes</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>43,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Cross-cutting activities</strong></td>
<td>682,000</td>
<td>609,119</td>
<td>191,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General management</strong></td>
<td>1,105,000</td>
<td>1,018,927</td>
<td>882,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be funded</strong></td>
<td>10,387,000</td>
<td>9,363,975</td>
<td>9,884,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other subsidies</td>
<td>489,000</td>
<td>480,131</td>
<td>704,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme contribution Foreign Affairs ‘07-’10</td>
<td>9,777,000</td>
<td>8,826,279</td>
<td>9,179,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme contribution PSO</td>
<td>152,000</td>
<td>83,346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>10,418,000</td>
<td>9,389,756</td>
<td>9,884,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability reservation</strong></td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>25,782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Balance sheet as of 31 December 2009 in €

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31 December 2009</th>
<th>31 December 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIXED ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible fixed assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme management software</td>
<td>46,516</td>
<td>72,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalised website development costs</td>
<td>38,587</td>
<td>57,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>85,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>129,256</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible fixed assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural changes</td>
<td>10,463</td>
<td>25,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars representation in Kenya and Mozambique</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>6,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>49,880</td>
<td>79,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>36,005</td>
<td>33,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>146,336</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalised costs to be funded 2007-2010</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receivables</td>
<td>11,986</td>
<td>4,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance payments and accrued receivables</td>
<td>690,661</td>
<td>441,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>770,853</strong></td>
<td><strong>582,409</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidities</td>
<td>3,114,562</td>
<td>772,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,070,579</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,630,352</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability reserve</td>
<td>25,782</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme liabilities</td>
<td>26,517</td>
<td>12,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch political parties (strengthening support base)</td>
<td>198,500</td>
<td>239,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated liabilities</td>
<td>86,170</td>
<td>29,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel related creditors</td>
<td>209,395</td>
<td>161,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other creditors</td>
<td>101,357</td>
<td>110,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy Ministry of Foreign Affairs received in advance</td>
<td>2,905,377</td>
<td>876,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other advance receipts and accrued expenses</td>
<td>517,518</td>
<td>198,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,044,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,630,352</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,070,579</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,630,352</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statement of costs and revenue and the balance sheet are abstracted from the annual report 2009 and subject to auditor approval.
Programmes

Africa

Ghana
In partnership with the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), NIMD supports a political party programme that has delivered a depolarisation strategy, an enforced code of conduct and a presidential transition bill which contributed to peaceful and fair elections at the end of 2008, and a smooth transition of power in 2009. Political parties conducted an intra-party analysis of the 2008 election results and lobbied together for the implementation of their reform agenda, the Democratic Consolidation Strategy Paper (DCSP). Its recommendation to start a constitutional review has been taken up by the government, resulting in the establishment of a Constitutional Review Commission which includes representatives from all parties and the IEA.

Kenya
Over the past year NIMD’s Kenyan partner, the Centre for Multiparty Democracy Kenya (CMD-K) has played a visible and constructive role in fostering a multi-actor dialogue, bringing together political and civil society around the national reform agenda, and building consensus for the necessary constitutional reform. CMD-K and the political parties also worked on the implementation of the Political Parties Act 2008 which resulted in the political parties receiving their first instalment of public funds. The year ended with a first draft constitution for Kenya, promising much hope for an improved balance of power in the future.

Malawi
Working with the Centre for Multiparty Democracy Malawi (CMD-M), the NIMD programme in Malawi has helped political parties to contribute to peaceful and fair elections in 2009. For the first time, political parties have worked together with the Malawian Electoral Commission (MEC), enhancing the transparency and credibility of the MEC and the election process at large. CMD-M has also promoted movement-based campaigning on the part of the parties and organised voter education.

Mali
Through its inter-party dialogue programme, NIMD’s partner in Mali, the Centre pour le Dialogue Inter-Partis et la Démocratie (CMDID), has been able to achieve consensus on constitutional reforms, including legislation that provides for the creation of a Senate, and the establishment of a single, independent institution to manage the electoral process.

Mozambique
The NIMD programme in Mozambique supports political party development and initiatives that contribute to the depolarisation of the political system. It has facilitated a dialogue of electoral stakeholders with the Electoral Commission in the run up to the 2009 elections. In cooperation with IDASA, and the Forum of African former Heads of State and Government, NIMD has founded the ILEDA School in Manica province, an initiative to strengthen local capacities for democratic citizen leadership.

Tanzania
Through the work of the Tanzania Centre for Democracy (TCD), the NIMD programme in Tanzania is focusing on electoral and constitutional reform. The TCD has been instrumental in lobbying for an amended Political Party Act, which provides for a more even political playing field. TCD’s contribution to the revised Code of Ethics and the bill on party financing is fostering political accountability and ethical leadership.

Uganda
In Uganda NIMD has helped political parties set up an inter-party dialogue platform that aims to contribute to free and fair elections and long-term democratic reforms. The platform, which is known as the Inter-Party Organisation for Dialogue (IPOD), was launched on 5 February 2010 at a signing ceremony in the Ugandan capital Kampala.

Zimbabwe
Supported by NIMD, the work of the Zimbabwe Institute (ZI) focuses on advocacy for the return of a stable democracy and a peaceful transition in Zimbabwe. ZI has facilitated both the negotiations in the SADC dialogue process and the tripartite discussions on the implementation of the Global Political Agreement (GPA). It has also helped the political parties prepare a constitutional outreach programme through country exchanges, induction training and the setting up of a joint secretariat.

Latin America

Bolivia
Through the Bolivian Foundation for Multiparty Democracy (IBDM), the NIMD programme in Bolivia promotes inter-party dialogue and provides technical assistance to lawmakers. The Foundation has played an instrumental role in the achievement of an agreement in congress on a new Constitution, which passed popular vote in January 2009. IBDM also helped the Electoral Commission disseminate parties’ programmatic viewpoints through mass media in the run up to the elections in December 2009.

Ecuador
In Ecuador NIMD works with International IDEA in a joint programme, Agora Democrática, that promotes inclusive politics and provides technical assistance to lawmakers. The programme has contributed to provisions for women’s political and economic rights in Ecuador’s new Constitution, assisted in debating and disseminating the new Constitution and helped design a new Electoral and Political Parties law.

Guatemala
In Guatemala NIMD supports the Congress in changing its rules and regulations, separating the political and administrative functions and establishing a technical support Unit. NIMD also supports the Permanent Forum of Political Parties (FPPP) that develops thematic proposals as input for policy making in Congress, such as the adoption of the National Security Framework and the law against femicide. The FPPP has become a nursery for upcoming politicians, thus contributing to the renovation of parties and a change in political culture. Another element of the programme, initiated in 25 municipalities, engages local politicians and citizens’ groups in an effort to devise a joint agenda for the development of their municipality.

Suriname
In Suriname NIMD supports inter-party dialogue, provides technical assistance to law makers, and facilitates a training programme on party development in which representatives of 21 political parties are participating.

Eurasia and New Regions

Burundi
In Burundi, NIMD and its local partner, the Burundi Leadership Training Programme (BLTP), facilitate various dialogue initiatives, one of which is the Permanent Forum for Political Parties. The Permanent Forum is an inter-party dialogue platform set up with a view to contribute to the consolidation of the country’s still fragile democracy. Its goal is to address democratic deficiencies, and produce jointly supported solutions that strengthen multiparty democracy in Burundi.

Georgia
In close cooperation with the Constitutional Commission, NIMD supports Georgia’s political parties in the development of a proposal for a new Constitution. A new and broader programme, emphasising strengthening capacities of political parties and setting-up an interparty dialogue, is being developed in close cooperation with the parties.

Indonesia
In partnership with the Jakarta-based Indonesian Community for Democracy (KID), NIMD supports a national inter-party dialogue programme in which seven political parties participate, and a political education programme, consisting of Democracy Schools in five regions, where young politicians, social activists and professionals are trained in democratic values and practices. Recently, KID has signed a contract with Kemitraan Partnership, a large funding organisation, to expand the number of democracy schools it runs from five to ten.