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ABSTRACT

Zambia is governed by democratic principles, which find expression in rule by the majority. As such, opposition parties are an important element of democracy and a person is free to belong or start a political party according to the system of governance that that person ascribes to. In a democratic society, those in opposition hold the party in power accountable and this ensures the principle of good governance is upheld. This is because when in opposition, a political party monitors the performance of the ruling party and acts to remind the same of the promises it made to the electorate.

This means the opposition parties act as a pressure group for the sake of upholding democratic values. Though they are there to provide an orderly system of changing government, they do not exist as an enemy to the government but have a responsibility to keep in step with the operations of the government so that they continue with development projects should their turn to be in office come. Thus, a free flow of communication between the party in power and those in opposition as well as among those in opposition is important to provide continuity of development projects.

To ensure smooth flow of information, there is a position of General Secretary to the Party who acts as a link with other parties. He or she is like an ambassador of the party. Through the General Secretary, political parties articulate their agendas to other parties. Therefore, the different parties are able to find a common ground with other parties. Inter-party communication is built up by this office to a point where it is easy to sit on a ‘round table’ and discuss issues of national importance that promote the interests of the country.

However, in Zambia, the situation is not ideal in as far as free flow of communication is concerned. This is evidenced at times when there is a function of national interest such as Independence Day Celebrations, African Freedom Day or some other function of national importance. The opposition normally are not involved. When queried, they claim not having been invited while the ruling party alleges it had sent out invitations to all political parties. This raises the question of whether the political parties are using an effective way to communicate among themselves or not. What channels, if any, are they using and how effective are they?
Due to this lack of communication, political parties are suspicious of each other and especially of the ruling party. They accuse the President of using underhand methods in the way he is relating to them. They cite examples of his poaching MPs and party leaders of smaller parties, for example, from Agenda for Zambia and National Christian Coalition. In these cases, what channels were employed to merge these with the ruling party and what alternatives can be provided so that the outcome would not result in anarchy and despondency among political parties?

At the same time, among themselves, opposition parties seem to have reached a deadlock on whether to work together or not. They are suspicious of each other and any attempts at forming an alliance falls through. An opposition party that comes out as pro MMD is accused of selling out and is thus viewed with suspicion. This is resulting in some MPs floating from one party to another oblivious to the system of principles the target party stands on. This situation is not winning the faith of the electorate. They now question whether a one party state is not better than a multi-party democratic rule. This is because the democratic kind of governance seems to concentrate on party bickering at the expense of the country’s development.

One factor that is giving rise to these confusions on the political arena is a lack of communication between and among different political parties. Since President Levy Patrick Mwanawasa came into power, there have been no inter-party meetings per se. No wonder he is not receiving co-operation from the opposition parties. Any attempt by him to extend an olive branch to the opposition leaders is thwarted as it is perceived to be a gimmick by the ruling party to serve its end. It is difficult to have trust unless there is easy communication among the political parties using the right channels. Hence, a research to find out the mechanism in place for communication among the different political parties was done to help to address the hostility existing among them. At the same time more effective means of communication were investigated to ensure that Zambia’s young democracy is nurtured.
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1.0. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1. Introduction

With the advent of plural politics the world over, countries are finding themselves with more than one political party to contend with. This situation has given rise to an interesting political scenario as different political parties compete to reach the top seat (Presidency). This state of affairs is seen as fertile for the development of democracy as the citizens are given a choice on who should rule their country. In addition, the presence of other political parties serves as a reminder to the ruling party that their days are numbered especially if they do not meet aspirations of the citizens. For the parties in opposition, they are given hope that they would get a chance to rule the country as long as they uphold the principles of good governance. Thus, they struggle to find weakness with the ruling party while at the same time portraying themselves as a better alternative. Inter-party communication is important to ensure all stakeholders involved stick to creating an enabling environment for harmonious and holistic political development. All political parties, regardless of their ideology, desire to play a role in improving the lot for their people. This is the link between all parties and it should provide the basis for the parties involved to come together and reach a consensus on the way forward for their country.

Prior to 1991, Zambia had been under the leadership of Dr Kenneth Kaunda from the time he led the country to independence in 1964. This prolonged hold to power led to an autocratic leadership blocking other voices from rising. The political environment was unstable, as any view contrary to the ruling party’s was regarded as unpatriotic. This, compounded by poor economic performance in the country, resulted into another wind of change (different from the one that led to the country’s independence from colonialism) whose climax was the Mwamba Luchembe led coup attempt of 30th June 1990. As a result of this event, which had been preceded by food riots in the Copperbelt and Lusaka, Kaunda also, under pressure from the international community, gave way to multi-party elections in 1991. This was scooped by a Trade Union leader, Frederick Titus Jacob Chiluba under the ticket of the Movement for Multi-party Democracy (MMD). With the coming of the MMD to power, democracy was given another chance. The formation of the MMD itself was an alliance of members from different backgrounds. While some were former United National
Independence Party (UNIP) members, others were new to politics with others coming from a military background which included former alleged coup plotters such as the late Edward Shawmwana, General Christon Tembo and Brigadier General Godfrey Miyanda. These had been incarcerated on charges of coup attempts against the government. The different members came together to provide a formidable force against UNIP and succeeded in their objective. As their first leader confessed in his book, *Democracy: The Challenge of Change*,

A more constructive way of viewing the MMD campaign in 1991 is that it was a remarkable exercise in coalition building and one which not only cut across occupation categories and different provincial lines but also took on board representatives of the minority ‘European’ white and ‘Asian’ communities. *(Chiluba, 1995: 73/4).*

This kind of broad-based representation reduced risks of social conflict and stabilised the quest for democracy. With the onset of democracy, more than one party existed. This created the need for a platform on which political parties could relate to each other and work together regardless of their differences. It is for this reason that, not only opposition political parties, but also other stakeholders place a lot of emphasis on inter-party communication. It is seen as one of the major ways that can be used:

To uphold democratic governance through consensus building mechanisms and as a means of providing a framework for consultation and negotiation between the ruling party and the opposition political parties. *(Added to these) inter-party dialogue’s significance is the provision of a popular participatory approach to resolution of imminent political and civil conflicts likely to negate universal human rights and culminate in political and civil strife. *(Afronet 1996).*

If democracy is to have a chance, a free-flow of communication is imperative not only between political parties but within the given parties themselves. There is need for co-existence in diversity and it can only be promoted through dialogue. The diversity is not only political but also religious and ethnic. Each group is inclined to protect its own interest. If opposition parties start using these interest groups to
champion their cause, the country will drop into anarchy. UNZA lecturer, Professor Jotham Momba, in his presentation during the ESAURP/UNZA Trainers Workshop for Political Parties stated:

I doubt if in Zambia it is possible to have a spirit of co-existence without Zambians beginning to fully understand each other, which can only be enhanced if we begin to build a strong culture of tolerance. This can only be enhanced through systematic dialogue which (sic) our own ignorance, prejudices and fanaticism about others. (Unpublished 2001:7)

1.1.1 Position and Size

Zambia is a landlocked country, located in South-Central Africa. Her neighbours are Zimbabwe, Angola, Namibia, Congo DR, Mozambique, Tanzania,
Botswana and Malawi. (See Figure 1 above). She lies from 8 to 18°S and 22 to 34°E covering an area of 752 614 Km². The land is divided into three relief features, which are low, middle and high. The low-lying areas are those below 900m, while the middle range from 900 to 1 200m and the high veldt area is above 1 200m above sea level. Lowland areas are found in the Zambezi and Luangwa River valleys while the high stretch from the boarder with Congo DR in North Western province through Copperbelt, Mkushi and Serenje to connect to the Northern part of the country and the boarder area with Malawi. The land is described as mostly high with 11 890 Km² covered in water.

1.1.2. Climate

The country’s climate is tropical with altitude affecting some areas as well. Being in the southern hemisphere the rainy period starts in October to April with the high Veldt areas recording highest rainfall and the low and middle recording lower rainfall with frequent experiences of drought. Thus, the rainfall pattern reduces from North to South despite the South being the breadbasket of the country.

1.1.3. Population

The Summary Census Report for 2000 shows an annual population increase of 2.5%, which pegs the population of the country at 9, 885, 593 from the 1990 figure of 7, 759, 167. From the current figure, 4, 939, 293 were female and 4, 946, 298 were male. Copperbelt was found to contain the highest population followed by Lusaka, Northern, Southern, Eastern, North Western and the least was Western province. Despite the Copperbelt being number one, its growth rate has reduced from 1.5% in 1980-1990 to 0.8% while Lusaka’s has increased to 3.5% followed by Luapula at 3.2% and Northern at 3.1%. Copperbelt’s decline can be attributed to mass migrations after the privatisation of the mining industry, which resulted in high levels of job lose. Though the percent distribution of the population has been declining for the province, it still remains the highest populated at 16% of the total population. It is followed by Lusaka with 14.1%. The Percent Distribution of Population can be illustrated thus: Eastern – 13.2%, Northern – 12.7%, Southern – 12.3%, Central – 10.2%, Luapula –
7.8%, Western – 7.7% and North Western – 5.9%. (CSO: 2003: 7). This can be illustrated as shown in Figure 2 below:

**Figure 2 - Zambia’s Percent Distribution of Population Per Province**

![Pie chart showing percent distribution of population per province.]

Lusaka urban has 75% of the 1, 103, 413-population figure for the province. In fact, for the entire country, 60% is said to be concentrated in urban areas. This makes the country the most highly urbanised in the southern region.

In terms of eligibility to vote, the *de facto* figure given in the Preliminary Census Report of 2000 was 3, 649, 255. From this figure only 48% had voters’ cards meaning only 1, 760, 094 of the entire population are able to take part in the voting exercise.

Zambia’s population is divided into diverse Bantu dialects with a small population of the citizens being of Asian and European decent. From the First Republic, the leadership has struggled against dividing political parties along tribal lines. The introduction of one-party state was based on this argument. However, seven of the tribes have been given official status. These are Bemba, Nyanja, Tonga, Lozi, Lunda, Luvale and Kaonde.

### 1.1.4. Communication

The major form of transportation in the country is by land. The road network is estimated at 64 000 Km with the major roads being the Great East Road from Lusaka...
to Malawi and the Great North Road from Kapiri Mposhi to Tanzania. The road network from the Copperbelt to Southern Province is generally good but in other areas, most roads are in great need of repair.

The rail line, like the road runs from Southern to Copperbelt and from Kapiri Mposhi to Dar-es-Salaam in Tanzania, the later route also followed by the Oil pipeline.

Though the country has long stretches of water, this form of transportation is still being operated at the traditional level. Most remote areas such as those in Luapula and Western provinces depend on water transport. Except for areas where it is used for fishing, tourism and hydro electricity, most of the water bodies remain untapped.

Air transport has been worst hit since the closure of Zambia Airways. Private hands are currently operating it.

The other aspect of communication is that of media. Its concentration is along the major road network. Despite technical advances in the use of computers and mobile phones, these are yet to spread to all corners of the country.

The state of communication has had an impact on the opposition parties to a level where most are reduced to a status of regional parties.

1.1.5. Economy

The 2003 Human Development Report, (UNDP) ranked Zambia as number 163 out of the 175 countries in terms of human development. She has been identified as among the countries that have been suffering economic reversal since 1980. The change from the Second Republic’s planned economy to a liberal one has not brought about sustainable economic improvements. Like other Sub-Saharan countries, lack of political will and the HIV/AIDS pandemic (which has reduced life expectancy) have had their toll on the country’s progress. This has placed her in the low-income economy with a GNP per capita of $635 or less; a big disparity with some other countries whose GNP is $7,911 or over.

The negative impact dates back to the early 1970s when the major income earner, copper started declining in value at the international market. Though the country realises the fluctuating nature of minerals and have tried to improve the agricultural and tourist industry, no proper long lasting policies have been
implemented to develop these sectors. The frequent droughts the country experiences and poor supply of agricultural inputs lead to poor yield with most parts of the country needing food relief to see them to the next season. This translates to high levels of ill health and illiteracy—poor conditions for sustainable democracy.

At household levels, it has seen a high rise in the incidence of poverty in Zambia. During the 1990s, *The Social Dimensions of Adjustment Priority Surveys* of 1991 and 1993 and *The Living Conditions Monitoring Surveys* of 1996 and 1998 revealed the trends in percentage as illustrated in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ZAMBIA</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Poverty</td>
<td>Extreme Poverty</td>
<td>Overall Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CSO: 2003: 2*

1.2. Background

From the time Zambia gained her independence, in 1964, she has passed through three systems of governance—multi-partysm, termed as the First Republic from independence to 1972; single party, which was called the Second Republic and went up to 1990; and then back to multi-partyism which is the Third Republic. These have had an impact on the socio-economic situation of the country.

Before this, the country was under the British rule. This period can be divided into two – the first under the leadership of the British South African Company (BSAC) whose capital was in Livingstone until 1923 when it came under British Protectorate. With the turning of the region into a British Protectorate, the situation did not change much for the natives. Resource distribution was still concentrated among the elite white settlers. The discovery of copper and its subsequent mining created a platform for black unity. This promoted the spirit of nationalism, which saw
formation of welfare societies and eventually political parties among the natives, for example, Dauti Yamba and George Kaluwa’s Rhodesian Federation of Welfare Societies formed in 1946 gave birth to the Northern Rhodesian African Congress in 1948 (Mwanakatwe, 1995). So strong was black activism that the settlers’ attempt to form a federation of Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia did not hold out for long.

The campaign against the Federation resulted into a fight for full independence. Kenneth Kaunda emerged as a leader of the popular UNIP, which had come to replace the banned African National Congress (ANC) in 1958. Therefore, the Federation had to give way to an all-inclusive election with UNIP making a convincing victory.

1.2.1. First Republic

At the birth of Zambia, the economic structure was very sound. The country’s major export dependency was based on the export of raw minerals, most of which was copper. Though the government in the First Republic tried to diversify the economy, this became difficult in the Second Republic with the scarcity of foreign exchange. Mwanakatwe reports that the copper prices were not as high as during 1965-70 relative to the prices of goods required for the diversification programme (1995:114). Apart from the low copper prices, the cost of mining the ores was also rising due to greater depths in mining and the decline in the ore grade. This forced the government to resort to deficit financing resulting in reduction in imports of essential raw materials, spare parts and other goods important for keeping the productive capacity of the economy operating fully. Such a problem was exacerbated by the volatile geopolitical situation of the Southern African region. Being a landlocked country, Zambia is highly dependent on a good relationship with her neighbours in order to trade. In the 1970s, Southern Rhodesia Ian Smith’s UDI and South Africa’s apartheid problems spilled over to Zambia causing her to re-route her imports and exports – a move that proved costly on the economy.

All these economic changes were taking place under the backdrop of political changes. As already alluded to, initially the country was under multi-party administration. UNIP was the ruling party with Harry Nkumbula’s ANC and John Roberts UFP in the opposition. However, the two leaders were also elected to parliament. According to Mwanakatwe, the independence constitution of Zambia
conferred wide powers on the President. Under the constitution, the President held executive powers. He was not responsible to any other authority except in certain circumstances when the courts might properly question his actions with power to declare them lawful or unlawful (1995: 85/6). At the same time, the constitution also provided for what is referred to as a Westminster type of parliamentary democracy, which provided for a ‘government in waiting’. Here the electorate is given the power to withdraw from government the right they were given to be responsible for the administration of the country.

Though the multi-party system worked satisfactorily in the early years of the First Republic, there was no attempt for the ruling party and opposition to dialogue. The condition between UNIP and ANC that had facilitated the natives’ victory were forgotten. As a major opposition party, ANC was at times cautioned to limit their contributions as it was considered as something that would confuse the humble folk of Zambia (Mwanakawe, 1995: 85). On the other hand, internal strives within the ruling party was building up culminating into the formation of the United Progressive Party (UPP) in 1971 by Simon Kapwepwe. The UPP was labelled a tribal party. Thus, this new development was not seen as an opportunity to work at creating a diverse united leadership but was seen as something that would reduce the country to strife. Consequently, Kaunda saw this as an opportunity to champion the cause of a one-party state. A chance to develop democracy was lost here. Kapwepwe’s share of popularity was looked at with suspicion, especially since the inter-party conflicts tended to be violent.

1.2.2. Second Republic

In a move to curb these divisions, the UPP was banned followed by the appointment of a commission led by Mainza Chona to establish the One-party State. This was seen as the best way out to avoid plunging the country into civil war. It was the common trend in Africa taking place at that time. An example was Tanzania where Nyerere had succeeded in institutionalising a proper balance between control and participation. (Mwanakatwe, 1995). Chiluba identifies some reasons put forward in support of one-party politics:
First, the adversarial politics, which arises from multi-party competition and the concept of a loyal opposition to the government which is so familiar in the British parliamentary system for instance, are said to be completely foreign to traditional, pre-colonial society in rural Africa. There, decision-making was organised communally. A second attempt to legitimise one-party in Africa draws attention to the bureaucratic and authoritarian nature of the system of governance operated beforehand by the colonial powers...In its treatment of nationalist in Zambia, the colonial authorities set an example with respect to some features subsequently incorporated into the life of the Second Republic, such as the surveillance of potential troublemakers, maintenance of the state of emergence and indefinite detention of dissenters. (1994:20-3).

Chiluba goes on to highlight other factors in support of one-party system such as the need to promote nationalism, which calls for all to unite. Multi-partysm is regarded as destructive to the objective of nationalism as it tends to encourage tribalism and/or sectionalism. Instead of people concentrating on development plural politics is also seen as taking from them the much needed development projects thereby leading to economic degradation. It can also cause the government to be swerved by other ideas from the path it may have taken towards economic recovery in its fight to maintain its hold on power. Such a goal was found not to be easily achievable in a multi-party state.

In explanation, Mwanakatwe wrote that the one-party state was perceived as a form of government regarded as a prerequisite for development. (1995:87). Moreover, Mwnakatwe also acknowledges the fact that UNIP’s introduction of the one-party state was an admission of failure to control the growing sectionalism in the country. By force and coercion, rather than through participatory communication, the government hoped to limit political opposition. Therefore, on 25th February 1972, Kaunda announced the government’s decision to form a one-party state. This heralded the system of planned socialist economy under the ideology of Humanism. The principles of participatory democracy were not easy adhered to as the President’s powers become stronger than in the First Republic. He was able to influence appointments of members of the Central Committee and the election of Members of Parliament making his position unchallengeable. This meant that only people acceptable to the president rose to those positions. In such a situation, it was impossible to promote the values of democracy.
On the economic level, the one-party system saw the nationalisation of the business fraternity setting in. The industries were placed under state control resulting in government-run parastatals such as ZIMCO, which was the mother organisation to a number of state owned industries among which were the mining, banking, insurance, retail trade and distribution, manufacturing and tourism sectors. This ensured UNIP had its hand on the vital organs of the country. Translated, it meant every citizen whether they liked it or not, had to pay homage to the ruling party. Such a set-up left no room to voice out dissenting voices. Subsequently, there was an air of intolerance for those who stood up to question the ruling party’s decisions. Without the watchdog role of the opposition parties, the media and other stakeholders, the economy by the end of the 1980s was on the brink of collapse.

This and other outside forces such as the fall of the eastern bloc, which saw a shift from single party rule to democratic rule, forced President Kaunda to concede to the general elections as a spirit of discontent was brewing among the citizens. The decade of 1980 had been rough with a lot of shortages of basic necessities. The concentration on mining was taking its toll at this period because, with loses in the industry, the government had nothing to fall back on. From providing over a third of GDP and over half of central Government Revenue in 1970, the figures for copper fell to 17% and 6% respectively by 1980. (Chiluba, 1994:53). The agricultural sector was in a poor state as a result of inconsistent agricultural policies while the parastatal organisations were just white elephants. They were mostly run by ill qualified party cadres and heavily subsidised by the mining sector. It was at this stage that a first attempt at inter-party communication started, initiated by the Church. This was following the deadlock reached over the Mvunga Constitution Review Commission’s (CRC) recommendations. The historical meeting between the UNIP and MMD leaders took place at the Anglican Cathedral in Lusaka on 23rd June 1991. Bishop Stephen Mumba from the Anglican Church had chaired the meeting. The two parties were able to reach a compromise. This helped ease the tension that was threatening to lead the country to chaos.

1.2.3 Third Republic

Not wishing to make the mistake of its predecessor, the MMD went on to make sweeping economic reforms including the abolition of exchange controls, wholesale
privatisation and deregulation (http://www.bized.ac.uk/virtual/dc/back/pol.htm.). On a political level, the MMD acknowledged and actually encouraged formation of other political parties in the hope that this would help to consolidate the democratic governance that it was working to promote. Under the then Vice-President Brig. Gen. Godfrey Miyanda, an inter-party Liaison Committee was formed to facilitate inter-party communication. However, this faded into oblivion prompting the opposition and civil society to call for dialogue. Eventually in 1996, the MMD convened a meeting on 29th April to prepare for inter-party dialogue. As Afronet reported, the actualisation of the meeting was hauled as being a long over due step towards reducing existing and imminent political conflicts. The second meeting on 6th May was supposed to be a continuation of the failed 29th April meeting. Another meeting convened with the help of LAZ on 13th May followed thereafter. All these were held at Mulungushi International Conference Centre (MICC). Although the ruling party was present in the first two and not the third, their presence cannot be described as beneficial as there were a number of shortcomings. These will be discussed later in Chapter five. However, it should be noted that their impact on promoting dialogue has been negative in the sense that it has been lukewarm. It is no wonder future inter-party dialogues have not brought about sustainable change. Moreover, during the Mwanawasa regime, strictly none has been held so far despite calls for one to be held. There are an estimated 30 registered political parties now, but for the 2001 tripartite elections, only 11 contested the presidential seat. At the time of the research, two – National Christian Coalition (NCC) and Agenda for Zambia (AZ) – were defunct leaving nine which are MMD, UNIP, National Leadership for Development (NLD), Forum for Democracy and Development (FDD), Heritage Party (HP), Patriotic Front (PF), Social Democratic Party (SDP), United Party for National Development (UPND) and Zambia Republican Party (ZRP).

Despite the introduction of a liberalised economy, the country’s embracing of sweeping policy reforms within the context of the Structural Adjustment Plans (SAP) has not translated well into the standard of living for the masses. There are high cases of unemployment and poverty is now estimated to affect 80% of the population from the 70% figure of 1991. In such an environment, the challenge of promoting trust among different parties is great as the factor of poverty is undermining the strength of the opposition parties. Already, at the time of the research, the leaders of the two defunct parties had been lured to the ruling party with the former NCC leader serving
as a state Vice President and the AZ leader as Chairperson for Publicity and Information in the MMD party. This has proved a great drawback in the Third Republic rendering the legitimacy of the government questionable. The former NCC leader’s appointment in the government resulted in some members of the opposition boycotting parliament in protest. They only started attending the sitting when they tabled impeachment for President Mwanawasa was to be discussed. Before any free-flow of communication can be created, the ruling party should take the initiative to first ensure there is an element of trust in the nation. This has also reflected negatively before the donor community who insist on a good record of governance before rendering help. Inter-party dialogue would be a good indicator of the government’s commitment to promote a transparent leadership.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Opposition political parties are also stakeholders in the development of the country. As such, they need a platform from which to contribute for sustainable development in the country to be effective. This is achieved when an indaba (round table meeting) with the ruling party is formed. Though they do get an opportunity to help chart the way for the country in Parliament, it should be noted that not all parties are represented in parliament, therefore, a different forum is called from which all the parties will have a chance to make contributions, since, after all they are governments in waiting.

Currently, the situation prevailing is that of distrust between, not only the opposition parties and ruling parties but among the opposition parties themselves. A trend of ‘blanket condemnation’ of the party in power is being promoted to an extent where an opposition party supporting the ruling party is treated with suspicion by the fellow opposition. This is not healthy for Zambia’s young democracy because there needs to be a trend towards a carefree relationship among the different parties. All have the development of the nation at heart and should view each other with trust. Though their priorities may differ, the overall objective is the same and this focus should be the underlying guiding principle.

Attempts at inter-party communication in the Chiluba regime were not successful resulting in the current leadership having a big challenge in opening communication lines among political parties. Though a show of an olive branch has
been made to the opposition, the opposition parties have not responded as one voice. In fact, individual initiatives to meet with President Mwanawasa have been labelled as traitorous; an example is the UPND’s President Mazoka’s visit to Statehouse. Mwanawasa has been accused of using underhand methods to get the opposition to work with him. His recent appointments of MPs from the opposition have not helped matters. This has resulted with some being fired from their parties and with consequent appointment of the same people as candidates for their former seats under the MMD ticket leading to a weakening of the opposition in the House. This started with Reverend Gladys Nyirongo and her colleague from the Heritage Party (HP). The recent ones have been the appointment of Dipak Patel, Chance Kabaghe, Silvia Masebo and others. Each party with representation in Parliament has received a blow of this nature. The disbanding of Nevers Mumba’s NCC and Akashambatwa Mbikusita Lewanika’s AZ parties have also been a blow to the opposition rendering the link with the ruling party a slim one.

A re-introduction of inter-party communication will help alleviate some of the insecurities rocking parties in the country. Already, the opposition parities have been calling out for dialogue through their inter-party caucus though it is not a representation of all the opposition parties. The ruling party is agreeable to such a meeting. It only remains to be seen what it is doing to achieve a free flow relationship. Once communication channels are opened the political leadership in the country will have moved a step forward towards achieving participatory democracy. Without participatory communication, sustainable democracy will not easily be achieved.

1.4. Rationale

The study is important because good governance can only be promoted in an environment of participatory communication. The opposition being sidelined in development issues will not move the country forward. In recent separate media reports, Mazoka and Brig. Gen. Miyanda have been quoted as having alluded to the use of alternative ways to handle the problems of the country. These remarks have been taken to mean the use of civil strife. They are made in frustration from the sense of impotent fury accumulated as a result of the party in power’s seeming failure to work with the opposition. A spirit of dialogue will provide a means through which the opposition will vent out their position on issues of national development. A research
on such a subject area is imperative to help bring about the MMD’s early objective of promoting democracy as envisaged by its first president. (Chiluba, 1995)

1.5. Objectives

1. To determine the level of communication between and/or among political parties in Zambia
2. To identify channels of communication between and/or among political parties in Zambia
3. To evaluate inter-party communications between 2001 and 2003
4. To evaluate failed inter-party communications between 2001 and 2003; and the factors that contributed to the failures
5. To suggest a more effective means of communication among political parties.
2.0. CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

2.1. Introduction

This chapter is an exposition of the methods used to gather data during the practical attachment with Southern Africa Centre for Constructive Resolution of Disputes (SACCORD), an NGO involved in peace building through constructive resolutions of disputes. An outline is given of the procedure followed to come by the information and the method of data analysis.

2.2. Sampling Procedure

For data collection, the student used purposeful sampling, which is a deliberate process of choosing whom to sample. This is because, out of the 30 political parties or so in the country, only a few are active. Thus, purposeful sampling ensures those active parties were targeted. The same was done for other stakeholders.

2.3. Data Gathering

2.3.1. Primary Data

Literature covering the period during Mwanawasa’s regime and before was collected from newspapers, reports and the Internet. This provided data for content analysis. The analysis was based on the following points:

i) Who called the meeting,
ii) At whose initiation the meeting was called,
iii) The channel of communication to organize the meeting,
iv) The themes of the Agenda of the meeting,
v) The political parties present at the meeting,
vi) The political parties absent at the meeting,
vii) The outcome/resolutions from the meeting.
2.3.2. Secondary Data

This was gathered during the practical attachment at SACCORD. Through the use of interview questionnaires and in-depth interviews, the student was able to gather the information needed. The focus was on determining if a given political party or stakeholder had attended an inter-party meeting in the given period, the procedure used if such a meeting had taken place and the purpose of that meeting. Added to this, the interviews aimed at determining the financial and manpower capacity of the parties as well as the parties’ and shareholders’ position on political defections and party funding.

2.4. Data Collection Procedure

While at SACCORD, the student visited the political parties and organisations under study. Interview questionnaires were administered on nine political parties including the ruling MMD party and ten organisations comprised of NGOs, church bodies and unions. Among the opposition, six of the parties selected were those that took part in the presidential election during the 2001 tripartite election and the other two, ZAP and NDP had not contested. The two non-contesters were chosen to act as a control group for the other six, which are Forum for Democracy and Development (FDD), HP, Patriotic Front (PF), Social Democratic Party (SDP), UNIP and United Party for National Development (UPND).

Using the same format, ten representatives from other stakeholders namely, the three Christian mother bodies, Council of Churches in Zambia (CCZ), Zambia Episcopal Conference (ZEC) and Evangelical Fellowship in Zambia (EFZ) were interviewed. And Non Governmental Organisations Coordinating Committee (NGOCC), Forum for Democratic Process (FODEP), The Inter-African Network for Human Rights and Development (AFRONET), University of Zambia Students Union (UNZASU), Zambia Congress of Trade Union (ZCTU), SACCORD and the Inter-party Caucus a composition of some of the opposition parties in the country. The non-political organisations were interviewed to assess the level of inter-party communication in the country and to balance findings from the political parties.

Apart from the interview questionnaires, in-depth interviews were also done with two public figures who have been directly involved in previous inter-party
meetings such as Zambia Alliance Progress (ZAP) president Dean Mung’omba who was then Zambia Democratic Congress (ZDC) president in the 1996 inter-party meetings. The other one was 1993 CRC leader John M. Mwanakatwe whose report contributed to funnelling the inter-party meetings of 1996.

2.5. Practical Attachment at SACCORD

The attachment with SACCORD helped the student understand how the NGO world is working in terms of advocating for issues of development. Unfortunately, during the period of the attachment, SACCORD’s projects did not touch the student’s area of interest. They were working on projects to do with civil military relations, Public Order Act, global partnership and corruption. The student was invited to be involved in the corruption project, which was focussed on whistle blowing. The other responsibility given was to assist with arrangements of the information desk.

Among the projects SACCORD has done, in terms of political party relationships, has done to do with providing education on how to deal with violence among rival parties, especially during election times. In the last tripartite elections, they came up with a Non Violence Community Awareness Campaign targeted at the grassroots. Different tools of media were used to achieve their objectives such as popular theatre, electronic and print media. They have always been quick to point out sources of conflict and recommend measures to deal with the issue at hand. For instance, in their report on Conflicts and Beyond (2002), they were not slow to blame certain sectors of the media for allowing themselves to be manipulated at the expense of national peace.

We all saw the Times of Zambia, Daily Mail, and ZNBC running stories almost everyday bearing tribal allegations against certain parties, tribes and individuals while realising plainly that what they were doing was a recipe for dividing the country. (23)

Their stand on how political parties should relate comes out in one of their objectives which is to undertake conflict prevention, resolution and transformation through providing mechanisms for resolving conflicts amicably. This is done by utilising programmes that create
framework for dialogue to happen, a condition for people antagonistic to each other to express
their views and communicate.

In keeping with the spirit of openness, staff at SACCORD relate well with each other. The Monday morning meetings provide a forum for them to share information. This is conducted in a free atmosphere and each member is given a chance to speak out. This is further enhanced by their taking lunch together. Meals are prepared at the premises. The same spirit extends to teatime when individual staff member would buy snacks to take with the tea/coffee. It gave the student the feeling of being in a family. It is in such an environment that conflicts would not have a chance to take root.

The student also attended evening programmes meant to provide fora to discuss issues to do with good governance. Notable among them was the 25th March 2004, FODEP organised discussion on Financing Political Parities: What are the issues? The panellists were composed of Dr Leo Simutanyi, a researcher at UNZA, ZAP president Mr Dean Mung’omba and Sylvester Tembo SG of ZCTU. Such meetings provided opportunities for the student to listen, not only to the scholars but also to public opinion on issues affecting inter-party relationships.

2.6. Data Analysis

To analyse data, triangulation was used, that is, the use of both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This provided much depth to the analysis of data because while qualitative examines the words and how subjects make sense of the situation giving one the opportunity to be descriptive and inductive, qualitative requires that the variables under consideration is measured. This ensures greater accuracy leaving no margin for error. The data gathered through the qualitative approach was then coded and entered on SPSS package where statistical analysis was made.

Added to this, the student used content analysis, which is systematic. By this is meant that the content is systematically evaluated by following one set of guidelines. This makes the approach objective, therefore, quantitative. (Dominick and Wimmer: 1997).

2.7. Limitations

The major drawback was lack of resources. This greatly slowed down the student’s pace of data collection. Uncooperative subjects compounded this. In the
framework for dialogue to happen, a condition for people antagonistic to each other to express their views and communicate.
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The student also attended evening programmes meant to provide fora to discuss issues to do with good governance. Notable among them was the 25th March 2004, FODEP organised discussion on Financing Political Parities: What are the issues? The panellists were composed of Dr Leo Simutanyi, a researcher at UNZA, ZAP president Mr Dean Mung’omba and Sylvester Tembo SG of ZCTU. Such meetings provided opportunities for the student to listen, not only to the scholars but also to public opinion on issues affecting inter-party relationships.

### 2.6. Data Analysis

To analyse data, triangulation was used, that is, the use of both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This provided much depth to the analysis of data because while qualitative examines the words and how subjects make sense of the situation giving one the opportunity to be descriptive and inductive, qualitative requires that the variables under consideration is measured. This ensures greater accuracy leaving no margin for error. The data gathered through the qualitative approach was then coded and entered on SPSS package where statistical analysis was made.

Added to this, the student used content analysis, which is systematic. By this is meant that the content is systematically evaluated by following one set of guidelines. This makes the approach objective, therefore, quantitative. (Dominick and Wimmer: 1997).

### 2.7. Limitations

The major drawback was lack of resources. This greatly slowed down the student’s pace of data collection. Uncooperative subjects compounded this. In the
case of political parties, only three had addresses. The rest had to be traced through
individual members followed up in their work places or homes. These then would
connect the student to the person authorised to answer the question on behalf of the
party. In some cases, the structures of the parties under study are so fluid that the
Party President or Party Administrator/spokesperson answered on behalf of the SG.

However, the data collected provided the needed information to come up with
the report that can help show the role of communication in sustainable good
governance in Zambia.
3.0. CHAPTER THREE: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Introduction

This chapter raises the theoretical background on which this study was based. These are communication, communication for development, participatory communication and democracy.

3.1.1. Communication Defined

Different communication scholars have not agreed upon the concept of communication. A number of definitions have been put forward. Let's look at a few identified by Heath and Jennings (1992). The first one is that defined by Gerbner, who describes communication as an interaction through messages. He defines a message as a formally coded symbolic or representational event of some shared sequence in a culture, produced for the purpose of evoking significance. The main weakness of this definition is its exclusion of non-verbal cues. However, there is an emphasis on the effort on both sides of the communication process.

Rogers and Kincaid argued that, through communication, participants created and shared information with one another in order to reach mutual understandings. In this case, people communicate in order to achieve an understanding. It needs to be stated that how a communication progresses is affected by previous communication encounters. Even when an apology is made, it will not erase what had transpired before but will only add to it. Rogers and Kincaid's definition will be used in this study because inter-party communication is about reaching a mutual understanding. At the same time, it is a process and not a one off thing. Each communication that takes place is a build up to the previous ones. The communication in this case is both verbal and non-verbal. In this case, the overall relationship existing between and/or among political parties is greatly affected by the nature of communication that has thus far taken place between and/or among them.
3.1.2. Levels of Communication

Figure 3 - The pyramid of communication

Few cases

- Society-wide (e.g. mass communication)
- Institutional/organizational (e.g. political systems or business firm)
- Intergroup or association (e.g. Local community)
- Intergroup (e.g. family)
- Interpersonal (e.g. dyad, couple)
- Intrapersonal (e.g. processing information)

Many cases

(McQuail, 1994:7) At each descending level of the pyramid indicated, there are more separate cases to be found and each level presents its own particular set of problems for research and theorising.

Our concern is the second level from the top. It is distinguished from the top level by being specific in its tasks. The levels below are all varied according to a shared feature of daily life, environment, interest, need or activity. Regardless of the level, McQuail brings out similar questions that communication and research normally addresses:

a) Who communicates to whom (source and receiver)
b) Why communicate (functions and purposes)
c) How does communication take place (channels, language and codes)
d) What about context (context, reference, type of language)
e) What are the consequences of communication (intended and unintended)

(1994:9)
3.1.4. Importance of Communication

Much of our daily communication is aimed at achieving goals. For one thing, it is the beginning of understanding. Without communication, no relationships will develop between two organisms. Mody agrees with this view:

Achieving communication is not easy. But it would be impossible to continue a truly human community without approximating it, without understanding each other, however, imperfectly. (1991: 41)

This is because it is an indicator of the level of relationships between the objectives involved. That is why the strategy and tactic of communication being used is important in helping to enhance relationships. There is need to plan and manage communication processes in a systematic and creative manner. Communication planning is the initiating of communication from its insertion through the implementation up to the post implementation phases.

3.2. Communication for Development

Communication for development implies the use of a communication process, techniques and media to raise people’s awareness of their situation and the options they have at their disposal for activities involving change. It also implies helping to resolve social conflict and working to reach a consensus. This way of using communication helps bring about sustainable development. It involves the use of participatory communication where all concerned are working together for the benefit of all players. The channel of communication chosen is the best to bring about the set goals. At the level of institutional communication, four core conditions of communication identified as necessary for participatory decision-making are:

1. Be formally and procedurally correct
2. Be cognitively adequate
3. Concern issues on which consensus and compromise can be reached
4. Be free of ideology (Patterson, March 1990:93)
According to Bohman as cited by Patterson these conditions from the normative theory are important so as to avoid communication failures. They help to provide a platform from which participatory communication for development can take place.

3.2.1. Participatory Communication

Mody defines participatory communication as:

The social process in which groups with common interests jointly construct a message oriented to the improvement of their existential situation and to the change of the unjust social structure. (1991: 30)

It involves equitable sharing of both political and economic power. It is for this reason that Servaes et al (1996) assert that structural change should occur first before participatory communication policies can be established. Servaes and his colleagues also identify two major approaches to participatory communication, the Freirean dialogical pedagogy and the second is as articulated by the UNESCO debates in the 1970s which involve the ideas of access, participation and self-management. Access refers to the use of media for public service, while participation involves higher level of public involvement in communication systems and self-management is the most advanced form of participation where the public exercises the power of decision making with communication enterprises. Thus, participatory communication is a two-way process involving dialogue, collaboration and group decision-making. In this way, every decision reached is regarded as the group’s decision. Nonetheless, when this does not happen, it means there has been a distortion of the communication process. This tends to happen when an issue or demand is prevented from reaching the public arena for discussion, instead there is a creation of pseudoconsensus. In some other cases, inequalities render participatory communication for development obsolete because it is difficult to reach a consensus, more so if the inequality is economic in nature. Inequality affects the ability and competence with which people enter discussions and deliberations (Patterson, March 1990).

The more members participate in decision-making, the more they are able to rule themselves. As John Stuart Mill states in the *Journal of American Political Science Review*, institutions remain democratic only through participation and that
rights become real only if they are exercised. (Patterson, March 1990: 93). Therefore, for a society to be labelled as democratic, the presence of communication is an indicator of how deeply rooted that society is in democratic governance. A spirit of intolerance for disseminating views is not an ideal condition for democracy to grow.

3.3. **Democracy**

According to the normative theory, democracy refers to an institutionalised process of communication in a society, through which members publicly deliberate and arrive at binding collective decisions. (Patterson, March, 1990: 102)

3.3.1. **Generalisations about democracy**

In his article in the journal of *Comparative Political Studies*, Bunce put forward general agreements about the concept of democracy:

1. High levels of economic development function as virtual guarantee of democratic continuity.
2. Political leaders are central to the founding and design of democracy and to its survival or collapse under conditions of crisis.
3. Parliamentary systems are a far better investment in the continuation of democratic governance than presidential systems.
4. Settlements of the national and state questions are crucial investments in the quality and survival of democracy.
5. Old and well-established and new and fragile democracies have as their common ground uncertain results but as their defining contrast, certain versus uncertain procedures. (Caporaso, Aug-Sept 2000: 713)

3.3.2. **Political parties**

One major feature of democratic governance is the presence of plural politics. Gichohi in his seminar presentation to the SADC-Parliamentary Forum defined political parties as:
A group of like-minded individuals who seek power on a political system by winning control of government or influencing government policies. (August 2003, Unpublished).

They are distinguished from other groups by the fact that they seek to exercise power by having elected candidates to public offices.

3.3.3. Functions of political parties

- They are an alternative government.
- They influence government’s decision and policy making.
- They provide an opportunity for good governance to prevail.
- When in opposition they hold the ruling party accountable to the people by providing a mechanism of accountability of checks and balances on the Executive.
- Aggregating various interests that are articulated by the various interest groups.
- To work at co-existence with other political parties by being loyal to the overall constitution of the land and the general principles governing the institutions and the laws of the political systems.
- Provide for representation in all spheres of human life.
- They are a means to reflect the needs and preferences of the poor and marginalized (i.e. accommodate interests of all).

3.3.4. Types of political parties

There are four types of political parties. These are:

1. Majority party-the ruling party
2. Minority party-opposition party
3. Parliamentary party-party has representation in parliament
4. Non-parliamentary party-no representation but has representation in the wider community.
3.3.5. The weaknesses of the opposition in Zambia

In the same SADC-PF Seminar, Saasa put across the following reasons why the opposition parties in Zambia have not sufficiently developed to a level where they can provide a credible opposition front.

i. The severe incapacity of the opposition to mobilise the resources, financial, material and human resources for keeping them active,

ii. The mobility of most opposition parties to curve a clear and distinct identity for themselves different from that offered by the party in power,

iii. The extensive capacity enjoyed by the ruling party and its ability derived from this, to co-opt people to its side and;

iv. The incorporation of senior opposition figures into the party power.

3.4. The Issue of Communication in Democratic Governance

As has already been discussed, communication is an important element in developing relationships. Subsequent relational encounters are always affected by the previous communication experience. That is why the nature of communication taking place is important in any relationship. In the case of political parties, the kind of communication prevailing within, between and among political parties is a great indicator of the level of democracy that the country enjoys.

Societies have been known to break into anarchy due to a breakdown in communication. This is because prejudices have taken the place of an open understanding. Prejudices breeds fear, resulting in the need for a sub group to protect and preserve itself. In order to do this, it may decide to destroy the other sub group before it becomes the target of a perceived destruction. In the end, the society breaks down into fighting. This build up can be broken up in a culture of tolerance and acceptance, precipitated by an ability to send and receive messages between source and receiver despite the two opposing camp’s different values.

The aim is to reach a mutual understanding thereby creating trust and a spirit of co-existence. It is due to this fact that communication is one of the main indicators of a mature democracy. In a society where different political parties are free to speak out without fear of reprimand, there is true democratic principles being adhered to. This platform to express oneself defeats the reason for frustration to build up, as all
are given a chance to vent out their views. There is no excuse to look for ‘alternative solutions’ to fight the ruling party except through the ballot.

Political parties and other stakeholders have a chance to suggest corrective measures without being labelled as traitors. At the same time, political parties are also challenged to be constructive in their criticisms, as the electorate will judge them harshly if they are seen to manipulate their position.

3.5. The Role of Communication Tools in Promoting Good Governance

With the technological innovations taking place in the field of communication, various tools are available to enhance the process of communication. These may be performed at the levels identified by McQuail of Figure 3. It may be argued that these can be abused and this is demonstrated in the way the mass media aimed at society-wide is turned into machinery that stifle democracy such that the tools prove to be a hindrance to promotion of good governance.

However, in a case where communication is being used for development, communication tools can be harnessed to speed this process. That is why the paper has emphasised on the kind of medium used to achieve a communication process. In situations where the media used has not been ideal, the process has broken down or not taken off.

In regard to mass media its role in promoting a democratic society cannot be overemphasised. This is why the media fraternity needs to have a sense of responsibility, otherwise it becomes a creature of the powers that be even in a situation where it has a measure of freedom.
4.0. CHAPTER FOUR: LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1. Introduction

The end of colonialism brought in a completely new social order, one unlike the pre-colonial era. People who had not belonged to the elite groups in the traditional leadership came to occupy positions of power and their influence cut across ethnic boundaries. At independence, they found themselves as an elite ruling class. A French historian is said to have described colonialism as a social surgery. This social upheaval was without its own consequences. The new breed of African leadership saw the dominant executive as an important requirement. Gupta explains it this way,

Monopoly of power was necessary in order to thwart possible challenges and party to distribute patronage among the ‘faithful’. From this followed the next logical step towards using the state as an instrument for political purposes. (1975:44).

Most African leaders argued that multi-party competition was a luxury given the state of their countries, which they perceived to be endangered by tribalism and sectionalism. Thus, they ensured that the opposition was neutralised and were it failed harsh measures were employed such as detention, press censorship or exile of the opposition leaders. Nationalisation compromised people to rally behind the government as only those seen to favour the leadership were given positions of authority both in government and public sectors. Consequently, countries started shifting to one-party rule. Ghana and Ivory Coast were the earliest to change to one-party rule (Gupta: 1975). Other countries also followed suit.

Contrary to their arguments of plural politics dividing the nations, the one-party rule was also found not to be a guarantee against political instability (Tordoff, 1967). Economic pressures and forces from without gave way to a return of multi-party rule. However, the form of plural politics at play now is very different from the kind practised in the western world.
4.1.1. Western World

Western countries have come to appreciate the importance of promoting good governance through multi-partyism. In the case of the USA, for instance, the 1787 Constitution did not envision the role of political parties in the government order. (Clack: 2001). However, by 1800, the country had developed parties organised on a national basis and was, most times, transferring power from either the Democrats to the Republicans or vice versa via an election. They have ensured all channels of promoting democratic rule are exhausted, inter-party communication being one of them. The USA, considered a premier democracy country, ensured they put in place a Constitution that stands the test of time. It allows for dialogue. Calkins et al said:

One secret of the Constitution’s longevity lies in the flexible ambiguity its authors built into it. The framers wisely avoided the temptation to solve every foreseeable problem on paper; instead they arranged that the cons should be adaptable to inevitable changes in circumstances without undue strain.(1975: 52)

This ensures there is a platform from which dissenting views can be ironed out without reaching a deadlock. In the United Kingdom, a Liaison Committee comprised of members from different political parties oversee the relationships among different stakeholders in the government. It submits reports to the government on the performance and relationships of various sectors of the government. This ensures healthy relationships are kept in diversity.

4.1.2. Reasons for Sustainable Democracy

Huntington (1999) put forward a number of views for development of democracy vis-à-vis inter-party communication. He posits that the future of freedom in the world is closely associated with the future of democracy. Furthermore, since the world is moving towards becoming an integrated society, unity is important within each nation for it to be fully integrated at the global level. If a nation does not promote democratic values it will be reflected negatively in other social values such as economic growth, socio-economic equality, political stability, social justice and
national independence. Thus, for the sake of a country's survival, democracy has to be upheld in all its forms.

This has given rise to a balanced voter population in the USA. The voter goes beyond party boundaries when deciding whom to vote for, as Clack (2001) cites Bibby stating that in 1996, 24% of voters split ballots by voting for different party candidates for President and the US House of Representatives. This pushes aside the idea of manipulating the voters. In fact, the USA voters are mostly regarded as multi-purpose and broad based in their electoral support except for African Americans whose 90% of their total population are inclined to be Democrats.

4.1.3. Pre-Conditions For Democracy

The traditional pluralism theory states that the Western world's progress towards democratic governance is attributed to a number of factors, among them being:

a) A wealthy economy whose promotion of education and mass media has resulted in an informed electorate. According to the economic theory, this factor ensures the ruling elite does not abuse its power and in a situation where they fall out of power, the economic resources are able to accommodate them.

b) The historical background has also been a contributing factor. There has been an argument that high correlation exists between Protestantism and democracy (similarly, also with Hinduism and Shintoism).

c) The external influence factor has been pointed out as well.

d) The fourth may be what American professor of Political Science, Nelson W. Poslby alludes to as the 'hundred party systems' masked in American two-party system (Targonski: 2000). Thus, while recognising two major parties—Democratic and Republican, the USA parties are not consistent throughout the land and in some cases blatant disparities exist. However, despite such variations, the intra-party unity is still healthy. Much so that they are described as being more ideologically unified and distinct from each other in their policy orientations. (Clack: 2001). This kind of flexibility within their ranks results in great tolerance towards diversity.
4.2.1. Sub-Saharan Africa

The Freedom House Index labels Sub-Saharan Africa as low in its democratic indicators. This region has seesawed from multi-party rule to one-party and back to multi-party policies. The common trend is where the ruling party has no proper channel of communication with the opposition, resulting in some cases into civil strife. In the case of Congo DR, Rwanda, Ivory Coast, Liberia and other countries in the region, it has resulted in civil war with the result being a need to involve outsiders to mediate talks among the different political groups. This renders Africa’s democracy very fragile.

4.2.2. The Case of Burkina Faso

Burkina Faso’s last coup d’état ushered in Blaise Campaoré in 1987 who decided to initiate the creation of good governance. The opposition, as a sign of lack of inter-party communication, boycotted the re-election of his party, CDP. This tension escalated to a level where President Campaoré sought to calm the tension by inviting political parties to participate in a government of national unity in 2002. Though not all parties responded to this extension of the olive branch, seven political parties and a few from the Group of 14, (a coalition of political parties from the opposition) signed an accord with the ruling Congress for Democratic Progress (CDP) and entered government. This move splintered the opposition between the ‘participatory’ and the non-participatory’.

The NDI in the run up to the country’s 2002 legislative elections initiated a programme to promote inter-party communication in 2001 and to work at establishing regular channels of communication.

McCannel (2002) identified three stages of the process:

- Assessment Mission
- Study Mission
- Roundtable Discussion

The Assessment Mission was carried out from 12th to 22nd May 2001, which involved meeting political party officials, members of government, civil society
leaders and journalists. The Study Mission followed in October from 17th to 25th in Mauritius. This comprised of four representatives from the CDP, two from the participatory opposition, five from the G14 and prominent members of the three branches of government, which included the president, Prime Minister, heads of political parties and electoral commission.

Finally, from 19th to 20th December 2001, the Roundtable was conducted in Ouagadougou aimed at enforcing the Study Mission and building consensus on the preparation of the elections. McCannel concluded by listing the five themes the Roundtable meeting discussed:

i) Lessons learnt from the Study Mission
ii) The new electoral code and its implications for political parties
iii) The role of political parties in Parliament and their responsibility in the democratisation of the country
iv) Maintenance and consolidation of inter-party dialogue in the lead up to the legislative elections of 2002.
v) International experiences with political parties during the elections

4.2.3. The Case of Zambia

Afronet did a study of the May to June 1996 inter-party dialogue meetings held at Mulungushi International Conference Centre (MICC). The notable contentions raised include the adopting of the Constitution, declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation, the requirement that only second-generation Zambian citizens be legible for presidency, amendment of the Public Order Act, Cap 104 and the electoral exercise of voter registration administered by foreign agencies and the country’s Elections Commission.

Based on the findings from the reports of the meeting, Afronet concluded that the meetings did not have properly laid down rules, hence they could not agree on anything even on who should chair the meetings. Thus, though the college of clergy was turned to, to chair the meetings, there was a loose agenda. Worse still, the state President did not attend any of the sessions rendering the meetings ineffectual.

Saasa (2003)’s assessment of the reason for the failure to dialogue between the opposition and ruling parties in Africa is the degree of disharmony and distaste
against each other. He expostulates that the languages of Africa have affected this worldview. In the African context, when one opposes, it borders on permanent disagreement with a degree of hostility. There is no element of loyalty in it, if anything, it connotes wanting to destroy what the other has developed. Hence, the opposition is looked at as wanting to ‘destroy’ and the ruling party as ‘protecting’ against destruction. A kind of ‘belonging to’ versus ‘differing from’ syndrome prevails.

Saasa (2003) suggests that there needs to be a shift in the framework within which politics is conducted including the need to educate the general populace in ways of thinking and acting that would be conducive to opposition thinking. At the same time, excessive pre-conditional ties for dialogue among political parties need to be avoided. Contentious issues he identified were Constitutional reform, Parliamentary reforms, Anti-Corruption autonomy, and electoral reforms to avoid unnecessary litigations against electoral outcomes and proper checks and balances in the Constitution to avoid misuse of power.

Mwanzah in his article in the National Mirror (2003) attributes the lack of inter-party dialogue to the independence view of enjoying the fruit of independence, which was referred to as the ‘national cake’. He cites Mwanawasa’s astronomical salary increases of the Constitutional office holders as an example. This has created suspicion among parties such that they are not ready to sit on a roundtable with the ruling party. Added to the issues raised by Afronet, Mwanzah points out Mwanawasa’s case on the adoption of the Constitution.

Therefore, the issues raised have been identified as important to be settled among the political parties. Thus, the research addressed how these issues have been dealt with and the role the opposition party has played in it all.
5.0. CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter records the findings that came from the approaches used, which are content analysis, interview questionnaires and in-depth interviews.

5.1. Content Analysis

The contents looked at are from the 1996 and 2003 inter-party dialogue meetings. The literature for this came from the Internet, newspaper reports and reports from CSOs that had been involved in the meetings. According to CCC (1996) there were over 36 registered political parties in Zambia in 1996. By 2003 an estimated 30 are said to have been registered. The terms of reference identified in chapter two formed the basis of the analysis. These are:

i. Who called the meeting,

ii. At whose initiation the meeting was called,

iii. The channel of communication to organise the meeting,

iv. The themes of the Agenda of the meeting,

v. The political parties present at the meeting,

vi. The political parties absent at the meeting,

vii. The outcome/resolutions from the meeting.

5.1.0. Inter-Party Dialogue Meeting of 1996

This is a focus on a series of three meetings held in April and May at MICC

5.1.1.0. MONDAY, 29th APRIL 1996 – INTER-PARTY DIALOGUE PREPARATORY MEETING

5.1.1.1. Who Called the Meeting?
The meeting was called by then ruling MMD party.

5.1.1.2. Who initiated the Meeting?
The opposition had been calling for an inter-party meeting due to a number of unresolved issues in the Constitution.
5.1.3. Channel of Communication
The notice for the meeting was done through electronic and print media, with each party being asked to send at least eight representatives.

5.1.4. Agenda
The General Secretaries met in the morning to work out the agenda for the Presidents’ meetings in the afternoon. LPF's Rolf Shenton chaired the meeting, a fact that did not go down well with the then MMD General Secretary Michael Sata. Consequently, they had to resort to the three mother bodies, CCZ, ZEC and EFZ to nominate a chair without prior consultation. ZEC General Secretary Father Mwebe was nominated. The agenda agreed on for the meeting was to revisit:

- Mode of adopting the Constitution.
- Declaration of Zambia as a Christian nation.
- Requirements that only indigenous Zambian citizens are legible for the presidency.
- The amendment of the Public Order Act, Cap104.
- And the electoral exercise of voter registration administered by a foreign agency, which was being viewed as subordinating the independence of the country’s Election commission.

5.1.5. Attendance
Not all the parties were present; notable is the ruling party leader who was absent for the Presidents’ session. Instead, junior government officials were sent. The excuse was that he was scheduled for an MMD Parliamentary Caucus.

5.1.6. Outcome/Resolution
The absence of the ruling party’s president rendered the meeting ineffectual.
5.1.2.0. MONDAY, 6\textsuperscript{th} MAY 1996

5.1.2.1. Who Called the Meeting?
The meeting was called by then ruling MMD party.

5.1.2.2. Who initiated the Meeting?
The opposition who had agreed, in the previous meeting, on this date for a follow up meeting.

5.1.2.3. Channel of Communication
A media notice that the state President would chair the meeting was the only one entered into.

5.1.2.4. Agenda
As a result, the agenda was not known. But the opposition assumed it would be premised on the 29\textsuperscript{th} April meeting. However, when it became clear that the state President was to chair the meeting and not the college of clergy, who had been relegated to the role of observers, the question of the chair became the main issue on the agenda. This went on for an hour without reaching a consensus. When the clergy present was turned to chair the meeting, they were reluctant, arguing that the 29\textsuperscript{th} April adoption of the college of clergy was a tentative arrangement, which had no prior agreement and communication to that effect. Afronet observed that the characteristic of the clergy present on this meeting was different from the last meeting in the sense that it did not present the April 29 executive officers of the three mother bodies but were merely denomination leaders allegedly biased to the government. Hence, these supported the idea of the state President chairing the meeting.

Eventually, at noon the clergy agreed represented by Father Mwebe. Nevertheless, the state President refused this choice of chair alleging that ZEC was partisan (this is on account of a Pastoral Letter dated 26\textsuperscript{th} April 1996). The college of the clergy refused to badge. The opposition in concession proposed LAZ to chair the meeting but by then the ruling party was not ready to sit with them and it walked out. Some members of the clergy also walked out and LAZ remained to chair the meeting on behalf of the opposition.
5.1.2.5. Attendance
Like the first meeting, the notable absentee was the ruling party.

5.1.2.6. Outcome/Resolution
The opposition parties in attendance made the following submission in the open session:

☐ Calls for civil disobedience.
☐ The need for citizenry empowerment in Constitution making and adoption.
☐ Need for election ethics and electoral practice consensus.
☐ Concerns that primary superiority should not be the basis for governance.
☐ Calls for civil disobedience.
☐ Concerns that existing legal instrument should not be used to alienate citizenry participation in Constitution making (that is, as was the Act, 1991 Invocation of Article 79 of the Constitution of Zambia).
☐ Concerns that former President Kenneth Kaunda’s citizenship should not be the overriding Constitution issue.
☐ The concerns that the ruling party walk out is evidence of (...) undemocrat dictum and;
☐ That the ruling party should be persuaded back to the inter-party dialogue. (afronet.org.za)

On the other hand, the MMD through a press briefing by the state President accused the opposition of trying to institute a Constituent Assembly through the back door. (CCC: 1996).

5.1.3. MONDAY, 13 MAY 1996

5.1.3.1. Who Called the Meeting?
LAZ
5.1.3.2. Who Initiated the Meeting?
The opposition parties had in the last meeting agreed to hold a follow up meeting on this date and mandated LAZ to issue a communiqué to this effect.

5.1.3.3. Channel of Communication
LAZ

5.1.3.4. Agenda
As per previous meeting agreement, the agenda looked at elections, Constitution of Zambia (Amendment) Bill, the Public Order Act (Amendment) Act, 1996 and electoral process (afronet.org.za).

5.1.3.5. Attendance
The ruling party and some other minor parties were not in attendance.

5.1.3.6. Outcome/Resolution

- Lobby members of parliament against the Constitution of Zambia (Amendment) Bill 1996;
- Seek legal resources to forestall the Bill being debated in Parliament and/or support the legal action already instituted by ZDC.
- Contest the state President’s citizenship
- Disregard the rules and regulations of the Public Order Act (Amendment) Act 1996, if it is not repealed;
- Adopt opposition’s contentions as election campaign issues;
- Lobby members of the donor community and
- Hold joint rallies and demonstrations. (afronet.org.za)

5.1.4. 2003 Inter-Party Meetings

The major weakness of this meeting is due to the fact that there were so many different issues to be discussed at the same time. Apart from the inter-party meetings, other issues affecting different sectors of the society were also being tabled.

5.1.4.1. Who Called the Meeting?
The State President
5.1.4.2. Who Initiated the Meeting?

The opposition and other stakeholders had been agitating for dialogue.

5.1.4.3. Channel of Communication

The first call was made through a rally organised by the MMD in Lusaka’s Chawama compound on 31\textsuperscript{st} August 2003. This was followed by invitations through Secretary to the Cabinet, Leslie Mbula who had been charged with the task of organising the meeting. Interested political parties and other stakeholders were asked to register their willingness to attend the meeting, which was dubbed ‘The National Indaba’. By 9\textsuperscript{th} October, letters of invitation had been sent from Cabinet Office and the following day, a list of individuals, political parties and organisations invited were in the state run daily papers. Some opposition parties condemned the manner in which the Indaba was being organised and threatened to boycott unless certain pertinent issues were addressed. In the Zambia Daily Mail of 14\textsuperscript{th} October, the Secretary to the Cabinet dared them to boycott because the Indaba had not been called to discuss narrow party interests but broader national issues...it was a national matter, which could not take the format of inter-party dialogue. (1).

The Post newspaper on 17\textsuperscript{th} October, the first day of the Indaba, also quoted the President as saying; they have no right to give him conditions over today’s Indaba because it is his initiative. (1). He was defending his position on using the Secretary to the Cabinet and his officials to man the secretariat. He said that there was no way that all stakeholders would want to be part of the Indaba’s Secretariat because that would cause differences. (The Post: 11). He however, challenged the opposition (PF’s Michael Sata especially) to attend, as failure to do so was cowardly. The eight-man committee led by the Secretary to the Cabinet continued issuing updates on the progress of the preparation for the conference through the media. They are the ones that announced that political parties that participated in the 2001 tripartite elections were to send three representatives and the rest one representative only. (Daily Mail: 09/10/03).
A day before the *Indaba*, the Chairperson was announced, former diplomat Dr Siteke Mwale.

5.1.4.4. Agenda

The agenda was to be designed around all contentious issues in the country. As the President was quoted as saying, there will be no agenda but we will only speak about ourselves. Let us see why we can’t see eye to eye. (*Daily Mail: 01/09/03*).

In an announcement, Mr Mbula had called upon those wishing to contribute to the agenda to give a three-day notice before the start of the meeting.

On the 13th, the agenda was drawn up for the different committees that were formed for the purpose of the meeting. The Political Parties and Inter-Party Relations, a sub-committee under the Political and Constitutional Issues had the following agenda outlined:

i. Inter-party dialogue

ii. Democracy within political parties

iii. Financing political parties

iv. Registration of political parties

v. Role of opposition parties in national development

vi. Integrity and morality in politics

vii. Need for national unity

viii. Gender issues

ix. Any other relevant issues (*Times of Zambia: 13/10/03*)

However, the other stakeholders complained that they were not aware of the agenda and called for a need to first agree on the agenda and other logistics before the date for the *Indaba* could be fixed.

They also called for the need to identify and agree on the Chair prior to the conference. As a result of the condemnation, coming mostly from the opposition, the Vice President, Dr Nevers Mumba responded by stating that the *National Indaba* was not an inter-party meeting but a cross-cutting gathering to set a common ground on various national issues. (*Daily Mail: 13/10/03*). Through the press, the Vice President
announced that a non-partisan person considered neutral by the public would chair the *Indaba*.

In a bid to diffuse the tension, the Secretary to the Cabinet was quoted by the *Times of Zambia* on 14th October as saying that the *Indaba* was also about inter-party dialogue. This was in response to some opposition parties' accusations that they were going to boycott the conference because it was not addressing, among other things, inter-party dialogue. These were the HP, UPND, PF and ZRP. The other concern was that the parties did not know the criteria used to pick who was to attend the conference and also their desire to have a pre-conference inter-party dialogue to iron out contentious issues.

In response, Mr Mbula said that political parties had been asked to nominate three representatives to participate in the meeting. He went on to defend the need not to approach the conference from a political angle. On the point of the need to agree on the agenda, Mr Mbula said that every Zambian had been given the opportunity to propose a subject for inclusion on the agenda and no one was to change it. (*Times of Zambia*: 14/10/03). Hence, the need to have a neutral person chairing the meeting.

5.1.4.5. Attendance

The conference was boycotted by most major parties because it was condemned as being too wide and lacking in focus. The total number of delegates present by the second day was reported to be 638. Out of these, only 24 chose to be in the Political Parties and Inter-party Relations Committee. (*Sunday Mail*: 19/10/03)

5.1.4.6. Outcome/Resolution

UNIP's Dr Simon Mwewa chaired the Committee on Political Parties and Inter-party Relations. They came up with a number of recommendations and the following touched on the issue of inter-party relationships and funding:

i. On Registration of Political Parties:

- Parties should be registered under a separate Act (not under the Societies Act)
• Government should prepare the relevant Law by 2004. The administration of this Act should not be subject to political and ministerial approval.

• The number of Political Parties should not be regulated. The main control will come from fulfilling the conditions of registration, which come with the Act.

ii. On Intra-Party Democracy

• Political Parties registered under the new Act must have their constitutional provision for elections.

iii. On Financing Political Parties

• There should be public funding of Political Parties represented or Council based on proportional number of seats; (Rejected)
• Parties should be required to fully account for funds and any public resources
• Parliament should pass the relevant legislation to get this implemented. (Rejected)

iv. On the Role of Opposition Parties

• Opposition parties should supplement government in national building.
• Government should do everything possible to accommodate the opposition parties in governance.
• Political Parties, both ruling and Opposition Parties should take steps towards managing their differences with mutual tolerance and respect.

v. On Integrity and Morality

• Giving of campaign gifts must be regulated and the police given the task to implement since the Electoral Commission are incapable of enforcement.
• There is need to considerably moderate the language of politics.
vi. On Inter-Party Dialogue

- Government to set up an Inter-Party Consultative Forum with a permanent Secretariat of public officers. This forum should be under a board comprising of representatives of political parties in Parliament and Councils. The meetings of this Forum will be quarterly. The first of such should take place in December 2003. The Chairmanship of these meetings shall be on a rotational basis.

vii. Electoral Reforms

- Voting age to be equated with the age of obtaining NRC (16 years old).
- An Election Tribunal to be established to dispose of Election petition cases expeditiously.
- Electoral Commission management system be overhauled to enhance public confidence and representation.
- There is need for severe sanction against Parties and candidates whose campaigners engage in violence.
- An MP who gets expelled by his/her political party should not lose his/her seat until the next election. On the other hand, an MP who resigns from his/her Party should be barred from re-contesting the by-election, he/she has caused.
- There is need to strengthen the legal provision that bars civil servants from holding office in Political Parties and engaging in active partisan politics and elections.

ix. Public Order Act

- Parliament should repeal the amendment to the Public Order Act
- The Public Order Act should require no more than merely notifying the Police of intention to hold a public assembly.
- The Public Order Act should not in law or practice empower the Police to give or withhold permission to assembly.
• There should be no requirement for notifying the Police for indoor assemblies in established premises such as hotels or public halls.

• No Political Party should be exempted from any notification requirements that apply to other parties.

x. Constitution Review Commission

• The new Constitution should be adopted by a Constituent Assembly, if that is what is confirmed by the CRC to be held the desire of the people.

• The proceedings and recommendations of this National Convention should be availed to the CRC as a collective raw input.

5.2. Interview Questionnaires

The research instruments (questionnaires) used are attached as Appendix 1, 2, and 3 respectively. The data collected from other stakeholders and political parties were coded and entered on personal computer for analysis with the help of SPSS. This helps not only to run the frequencies of different variables but also to cross-tabulate.

5.2.1. The Ruling MMD Party

5.2.1.1. FINDINGS

The MMD party was interviewed because they are the party in power and have been since the re-introduction of multi-party politics – during Chiluba’s leadership in the 90s and now during Mwanawasa’s reign. Their responses serve as the point of comparison with the other stakeholders and opposition parties.

5.2.1.2. MEETINGS WITH THE OPPOSITION

Since 2001, the party claimed to have initiated and attended between one to four official meetings with the opposition. The purpose of these meetings was said to be consultation. Though the call for these meetings was directed at all the opposition, only UNIP has been in attendance.
5.2.1.3. PARTY FUNDING AND ASSETS

The MMD takes no stand on government funding political parties but is waiting to hear the decision of Parliament.

In terms of assets, the party admits to owning some and having full time employees numbering over 15.

5.2.1.4. WAY FORWARD

Concerning its position on improving inter-party relationships, the party challenges the opposition to respond favourably to calls it has been making for inter-party meetings.

5.2.2. Stakeholders

5.2.2.1. FINDINGS

Before presenting the findings of the interviews, the characteristics of the organisations were discussed in terms of whether they have taken part in official inter-party meetings of any kind. By official was meant the use of proper channel of communication to call the meeting which being the use of Secretaries General’s office. The other characteristic was the period in which the said organisations have been in existence and the position of the respondents in the same. Most of them were formed before 1991, before the rebirth of multi-partism. Table 2 below illustrates this:
Table 2

However, in terms of service in the organisation, 60% of the respondents started work after 2002. The position of the respondents from each organisation varied depending on their structures. This is demonstrated in Table 3 below:

Table 3 - Position in Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog. Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group S/person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2.2. RECORD BEFORE 2001

To determine the level of the organisations’ involvement in inter-party relationships before the Mwanawasa regime, they were asked if they had attended any inter-party meetings prior to 2001. Ten percent had not been in existence then, while
10% were not sure. For 30%, their claim was that they had not attended any meeting and 50% agreed to have attended. On the role of the organisation in the meetings, 30% said they went as mediators and 20% as participants.

**Table 4 - Role of Organisation in Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, of the 90% organisations that had existed before 2001, only 30% had contributed to the agenda of some of the inter-party meetings.

**5.2.2.3. RECORD AFTER 2001**

With regard to after 2001, which was the period leading to the tripartite elections in December 2001 and during Mwanawasa's regime, up to December 2003, all the organisations under study agreed to have attended inter-party meetings. **Table 5** below shows the result of the 70% who had actually taken the initiative of attempting to host an inter-party meeting.

**Table 5 - Result of Initiative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike the frequencies prior to 2001, during Mwanawasa’s regime, the role of the organisations in the meetings was split among facilitator (20%), mediator (20%) and participant (50%) while 10% claimed their role was that of mediator, participant and consultant. The purpose of the meeting(s) are tabulated below:

**Table 6 - Purpose of after 2001 Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consensus building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons b., Reso. &amp; Consul.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2.4. POSITION OF ORGANISATION ON PARTY FUNDING AND DEFECTIONS

The organisations under study are split almost in half on their position regarding whether funding political parties will improve inter-party relationships. While 60% support the idea, 40% are against. However, they all are against party defections though their responses have varied.

i. Twenty percent have been lobbying for constitutional change to bar defectors from standing for MP for a given period of time.

ii. Twenty percent have been condemning the act by releasing statements.

iii. A good majority (40%) have taken both step i and ii.

iv. Ten percent see educating the voters as the only out.

5.2.2.5. THE FACTOR OF SEX ON THE CHOICE OF RESPONSE

On the issue of the purpose for the meetings and the role of the organisation in the same, sex seemed to affect the choice of responses. Over all, 60% of the respondents were male and 40% female. While 20% of the female chose consensus
building as the purpose of the meetings during Mwanawasa’s regime, none of the male respondents chose this alone. Instead, it was grouped with resolution and consultation by 20% of the males and 20% picked consultation only.

On the role of the organisation in the meetings, 20% of the female respondents claimed their organisation went in as a facilitator against 0% of the male. The male mostly leaned on the role of participant (40%), which only had 10% of the female.

5.2.2.6. THE FACTOR OF AGE OF THE ORGANISATION

While 60% of long serving organisations made attempts at initiating dialogue, only 10% of the young organisations have taken such an initiative. As a result the 30% who agreed to have been part of the agenda setting are from the older group. In fact, the older organisations do not support the idea of improving inter-party relationships by funding political parties. Nevertheless, all those formed after the third republic view this idea favourably.

5.2.2.7. ORGANISATIONS’ POSITION ON IMPROVING INTER-PARTY RELATIONSHIPS

Asked on the position to be taken to improve inter-party relationships, the following were highlighted:

- Meetings to be based on a common agenda and on equal basis.
- Holding of scheduled dialogue to be facilitated by an Inter-Party Liaison Committee to be part of the constitution.
- To introduce a government of national unity (coalition).
- Curb dependence on cadres as they inflame the situation.
- To have inter-party meetings chaired by a neutral person and held in a neutral venue.
- The ruling party to strive to be tolerant (give and take) of divergent views to encourage exchange of ideas.
- Make institutions of democracy independent e.g. Parliament, Judiciary, Electoral Commission etc.
- Creation and promotion of opportunities for party leaders to interact, this will trickle down to lower organs.
- Reduce powers of the executive in order to ensure he is able to bargain instead of acting without consultation.
- Educate leaders to appreciate the position of opposition in promoting the democratic framework.
- The ruling party to take deliberate steps to tone down on issues that heighten conflict.

5.2.3. The Opposition

5.2.3.1. FINDINGS

The parties were selected on the basis of them having taken part in the 2001 tripartite elections. One party was as a result of being in existence since the re-emergence of plural politics and another, because it was formed as an alliance of some parties opposed to the Chiluba regime.

However, of the 11 political parties that took part in the last elections, two (AZ and NCC) are now defunct and have since joined forces with the ruling party; the other, NLD could not be traced nor its status determined. ZRP was not forthcoming and attempts to meet with the Party leadership at their work places and their Party Headquarters proved futile.

5.2.3.2. FORMATION

With the exception of UNIP, which has been in existence since before independence and NDP, which was formed in 1991 during the run up to the multiparty elections, all the parties under study were formed during Chiluba’s second term of office, mostly the later part of his tenure.

The Secretaries General are even younger in office, with most of them having taken up their positions after 2002.
5.2.3.3. RECORD BEFORE 2001

Of the parties under study, 63% stated that they have not held any official meetings with the ruling MMD party. Of the 38% that did, they reported that the venue for the meetings were in neutral places. One claimed the purposes of the meetings were consensus building, another consultation and the third specified consensus building, compromise, resolution and consultation.

In terms of who initiated the meetings, while one said it was the inter-party dialogue committee, the other claimed it was out of their own initiative. In any case all agreed to have contributed to the agenda of the meeting.

5.2.3.4. RECORD AFTER 2001

(a) Meetings with the MMD

Like in the period before 2001, the bigger percentage of the parties (75%), declared not to have made attempts to meet with the ruling party though about 86% have had meetings with fellow opposition parties.

For those that agreed to have met with the MMD, their record is between one and four meetings. Two said the MMD initiated these meetings for the purpose of compromise and consensus building. The one party that said they initiated the meeting themselves chose consensus building.
In response to the question why the parties had not initiated any meetings with the ruling party, most parties alluded to the issue of the MMD not being interested in serious dialogue. One went on to add that the ruling party twisted the last meeting held with them for mere propaganda.

(b) Meetings with the Opposition Parties

All parties have a record of meeting with fellow opposition parties since 2002 except for one, which was not sure. Their record is good with most pegging the meetings between 5-9 (38%) and the same percentage putting it at 10 and above. One party put the figure within 1 and 4. The reasons for the meetings ranged from consensus building, compromise, resolution, consultation and attempt to form a government of national unity (alliance). In any case, these meetings were not a composition of all the opposition parties, but some of the opposition.

5.2.3.5. POSITION OF THE OPPOSITION ON PARTY FUNDING AND DEFECTIONS

The general trend among the opposition is, “If it hasn’t happened to me, then I don’t make my position known”. This was shown on their position on party defections. Those that have suffered loss felt disappointed with the ruling party, which was the recipient and some to the extent of calling a change in the constitution to allow for a situation where it would be difficult for one to jump from one party to the other. Those without the challenge of having lost an MP to another party have taken no stand. However, two of the opposition parties without representation in parliament were in support of the change of constitution.
Table 7 - Number of defectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While one party stands on the need for government to finance political parties, 50% specified the need for only those with representation in government. The other 38% that supported funding did so on condition that a party should either meet a prescribed criteria which should be reflected in the constitution.

5.2.3.6. CAPACITY OF THE OPPOSITION

With the exception of two parties, the opposition parties denied owning any assets and most of them confessed to not having full time employees. For those that have full time employees, two said they had less than five and only one had over 10.

5.2.3.7. OPPOSITION PARTIES’ POSITION ON HOW TO IMPROVE RELATIONSHIPS.

- Remove influence of the executive from parliament in order to strengthen the opposition in parliament against being easily compromised or undermined.
- Openness and sincerity and confidentiality when approaching dialogue (honesty and integrity).
- Through the republican constitution, defining the framework under which political parties should operate.
- Ruling party not to approach the opposition in a manner implying they are doing them a favour.
- Government to understand the kind of unity the citizens want and to fashion that unity according to the people’s needs.
Frequent meetings would reduce suspicion and mistrust. This will need a permanent forum.

Need to communicate during the meeting and not just one-sided (dialogue of the deaf).

5.2.4. Personal Interviews

The student carried out one-on-one interviews with subjects who have played a role in the country’s political life.

5.2.4.1. DEAN MUNG’OMBA

The respondent identified for the interview is one of the founders of the MMD party and among the first to leave the party barely three years in its term of office. He formed another party, Zambia Democratic Congress (ZDC), which later changed to Zambia Alliance Party (ZAP) after ZDC joined in an alliance of a number of opposition parties but later he pulled out.

The purpose of the interview was to gauge the reaction of one of the parties that had been present during Chiluba’s regime and get their assessment of the 1996 MICC inter-party dialogue meeting.

Responding on what the theme of these meetings was, the respondent said it was a focus on the Mwanakatwe’s CRC report. The opposition had been the ones to initiate the meeting. Dissatisfaction was expressed with the way the meetings turned out in the sense that they lacked protocol. The general view expressed about inter-party meetings was that they were not motivated by interest to serve the nation. Each party seemed only interested in building their own self-image with each party leader present seeing himself as the President.

Making a comparison with Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), the respondent believed they were succeeding in their objectives because their ambition is to serve people. Unless political parties pick up this objective of service, the CSOs and labour unions would take over government.

Hence, while communication is important, the question is what is being communicated. Commenting on the 2003 National Indaba, he said it was a waste of
effort and finances. For one thing, the agenda was set by the MMD alone and none of the resolutions is being worked on yet.

The subject admitted to the patrimonial behaviour in parties as a negative effect in the sense that cadres tend to side with the leader blindly without ever taking an independent stand. Thus, only one person defines the party. However, in a way, that person is also being used as well.

5.2.4.2. JOHN M. MWANAKATWE

The other respondent for the one-on-one interview has worked with the three regimes. In the first and part of the second republic, he served under the UNIP government till 1978 when he retired from active politics and went into private legal practice. When the Chiluba led MMD party came into power, they approached him to lead the CRC, which is now termed as the Mwanakatwe Constitution. In Mwanawasa’s reign, he has been awarded the Order of Distinguished Service.

He agrees that inter-party communication is an indicator of democracy as it enables various political views to be expressed freely. In terms of issues to be discussed during the meetings, he believes there should be no restrictions though given the situation in the country, emphasis should focus on developmental issues. There is, therefore, no limit to the number of times the meetings are to take place and restrictions to who should chair such meetings. In fact, chairmanship should not be a monopoly, but each party regardless of size should have an opportunity to appoint a chair.

The subject was also asked to comment on the issue of finance as regards political parties. Concerning government funding political parties, he is of the view that the resources of the country should go towards development; otherwise the country would end up with more parties than commercial enterprises. He goes on to refute the idea of political parties first proving their financial capability before being registered because it would infringe on the constitutional right of promoters of a party to associate freely with other persons. He believes freedom of association to be a fundamental human right, which is entrenched in the Constitution of Zambia, a right inseparable from democracy.

Asked about the major issues related to inter-party relationships raised in the CRC he chaired, the respondent identified the negative role of numerous political
parties. By this he meant the way parties encouraged tribal and regional tensions, funding of political parties and the restrictions of use of government motor vehicles to Minister’s use only, a privilege which was denied to ordinary MPs.

On comparing inter-party relations of the three regimes, the subject described that of Kaunda in the first republic as lukewarm. This same kind of relation prevailed with CSOs as well. Chiluba’s was said to have had a multiplicity of opposition parties, which though vocal were ineffective. He described the relationship of the regime with CSOs as good. He observed that though the current regime was still too young, its show of an olive branch to the opposition and CSOs had an intention of promoting self-interest rather than for the purpose of consolidating good governance.

Consequently, he sees no hope for positive relationships in the near future. Healthy inter-party relationships cannot exist in an environment in which politicians are selfish and self-centred. With very few exceptions, political parties in the country exist merely to promote selfish interests of leaders of political parties and their supporter. The national interests are given a back seat in Zambia today.
6.0. INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

6.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings tabulated in chapter five. These will be discussed in relation to the concept of communication as an indicator of inter-party relationships in the period since Mwanawasa came to power. The points raised in chapters three and four will be used as a framework to expound the findings of the research. The terms of reference mentioned in chapter two are also used in this part of the report.

6.2. Content Analysis

6.2.1. The Chiluba Regime

To appreciate the situation in as far as the current state of inter-party relationship is concerned, a case study of the 1996 inter-party meetings convened at MICC was analysed. This period was a lead up to the first tripartite elections since the re-introduction of plural politics. These meetings were an attempt to reconcile the different parties, when the schism among them was threatening to prove inseparable. The MMD succumbed to the pressure from the opposition and CSOs to meet with the opposition.

However, the strength of their willingness to meet was very fragile, such that at the least provocation, they were not willing to compromise. This is demonstrated in the way the 29th April meeting turned out. The MMD did not want to have a representative from the opposition to chair the meeting for Secretaries General. As a result, at short notice, the college of clergy had to step in represented by the Secretary General for ZEC.

Despite the giving in of the opposition, when it came to the President's meeting in the afternoon, the MMD president sent only representatives. This is despite the fact that they are the ones who had called for the meeting. However, it looks like a reaction to the Secretaries General’s meeting in which, the ruling party was not allowed to chair the meeting. As a result, the meeting did not have the desired impact.
Similarly, the 6th May meeting was called by the MMD. Based on the outcome of the previous meeting, they announced through the media that the president would chair the meeting. They did not even communicate the agenda to the opposition. On their part, the opposition believed the meeting would follow the same line as the previous one. Hence, their refusal to badge when it turned out that the MMD wanted to chair the meeting as per media report. At this point, each party's refusal to give in blocked the opportunity to improve subsequent communication encounters. As has already been discussed, communication is a process, meaning that subsequent communication encounters are affected by previous communication encounters. In this case, the unresolved April 29th meeting between the ruling party and the opposition caused a block when the 6th May meeting came up.

Heated exchanges followed till in the afternoon when the resolved to have LAZ chair the meeting. By then, the MMD group was not ready to compromise and left the meeting. The point of the MMD was that ZEC was not a good choice, but in light of their refusing to stay for the meeting even when the chair was changed was a sign that they were not just willing to dialogue. While the media is a tool for development, rival groups also use it to score points.

Hence, they turned to the media to defend their position. Being a party in government, they were able to mobilise the state owned media and hold a press briefing. From this platform, the opposition was blamed for the failure of the meeting. With such a powerful tool at their disposal, the reputation of the opposition was tarnished as it looked like they were not ready to work towards upholding the peace in the nation.

This antagonism made the outcome of the 13th May meeting predictable – the ruling party and some opposition were not present. The resolutions made reflect that the MMD was being challenged. The opposition was deliberately taking a stand that would make future communication encounters difficult. Moreover, their continuing with the meeting was not reconciliatory but divided the opposition in two camps, those against the ruling party and those for.

6.2.2. The Mwanawasa Regime

Mwanawasa came into power amidst an outcry from some of the opposition and CSOs against his victory. He was unexpectedly picked as Chiluba’s successor after
the third term bid failed. The MMD and republican constitutions allow for a president to serve only two terms, so when Chiluba’s second term was nearing its end, their was a call from interested parties to have him stand a third time. This was going to change the two constitutions. However, the CSOs, other opposition parties and even some leaders in the MMD challenged this and organised a campaign that came to be referred to as the Green Ribbon Campaign. Chiluba had no choice but to succumb to pressure and look beyond his clique for a successor.

Mwanawasa had been one of the founders of the party. His stay in the MMD leadership had been short lived due to poor intra-party relationships. Unlike Mung’omba, when he resigned his government position, he did not form another party but went back to private legal practice. Therefore, it was a surprise to other party leaders when Chiluba appointed Mwanawasa to succeed him. This resulted in the formation of other political parties, namely FDD, HP and eventually PF. Following Mwanawasa’s victory, the opposition cried foul and some challenged this victory in court. At the time of the research, the case was still in court.

Thus, from the outset, Mwanawasa’s position has been precarious no wonder he tends to take a defensive approach in the decisions that he makes. Take the call for the National Indaba made during a party rally; he refused to accommodate the opposition in the preparation for the conference. Holding a meeting with so many different interests was just a cover up to give an impression of having met the opposition but doing so in a ‘safe’ environment surrounded by other groups

Calls from the opposition and other stakeholders to hold a separate inter-party meeting landed on deaf ears. Even when challenged to first resolve certain contentious issues such as deciding whom to chair the meeting or asked on why he was using Cabinet Office to organise the meeting, his response was defensive. He declared that since it was he who had called the meeting no one had a right to dictate to him. No wonder the Secretary to the Cabinet dared the opposition parties issuing condemnations and threatening to boycott to go ahead and boycott the meeting. The Vice President was also quoted as saying that the indaba was not an inter-party meeting but was more than that. These responses trivialised the aspect of inter-party dialogue. While it needs to be appreciated that other national issues are important, the issue of a good inter-party relationship is very cardinal. Without a good working relationship among all stakeholders, it is difficult for development to take place. As Mody, mentioned earlier, states, it is impossible to continue a truly human community
without attempting to achieve communication. The opposition has a reasonable representation in parliament (legislature) therefore; working with them would benefit the ruling party a lot. The success achieved as a result of working with them would reflect positively on them being a party in government.

The *indaba* became so politicised that the country was split in two, with those for and against it. The ‘for’ group was forced to defend everything that was being done in relation to the meeting while the ‘against’ group was busy condemning everything. Like the 1996 meetings, public media became a channel of communication. Through the media, Mwanawasa stated that failure to attend the *indaba* would be cowardly. This was in reaction to PF leader Michael Sata’s threats that his party would boycott the conference. Other parties and stakeholders were expressing similar sentiments.

When it became clear that the opposition was serious about boycotting the *indaba*, the Secretary to the Cabinet changed his tone by stating that the conference was about inter-party dialogue. He cautioned against being political when discussing the conference.

However, the damage was already done as was witnessed by most parties not being present for the conference. As a result, the committees dealing with political parties and governance were poorly attended.

The *indaba* was too broad based such that the impact of each committee was watered down. Though it is recommendable to meet with stakeholders, the channel used gave the impression like the ruling party had another objective for calling for a meeting of such magnitude. This comment is made in light of the Willie Mung’omba led CRC that was in the process of receiving submissions from members of the public at that time. The various stakeholders invited to the conference could very well have made their contributions to the CRC than duplicate the work of the Commission. To meet in the manner of the National *Indaba* to ‘talk about ourselves’ as the state president put it, was too costly given the country’s level of economic development. The government should have a channel of communication with different stakeholders such that their contributions will be received at a much lower cost. For instance, political parties have an office of the Secretary General through whom communication can take place. Having an established channel reduces on the tension and suspicion created due to mistrust of each other. As it is, the talks are falling through mainly because the opposing sides are wary of each other.
The media, as has been stated, tends to be used as a tool to achieve one's goals. This means it is subject to abuse. The fears raised by the CCC cannot be overemphasised. Allowing itself to be used to create schism in society is the lowest that it can sink. In the case of state owned media, the ruling party uses them to justify their actions and come out like they are not to blame for the poor relationship existing between them and the other groups. Using the private media, the other camp also pushes the blame towards the party in government. This back and forth approach widens the schism between the different factions such that bridging it to create a free flow of communication proves a mammoth task.

The general public remains in the dark concerning the true state of affairs. This mostly finds expression among lower organs of parties where the cadres agitate for certain things based on the assumption that it is what their leader wants. On the other hand, the leader may want to work and improve relationships with his/her rival but the over enthusiasm of the cadres frustrates such efforts. At the end of the day, the leader is forced to go with the crowd as attempting to establish links with the opposition would look like a betrayal. This is what the ZAP president must have meant when he said the leader is in a way being used as well.

The recommendations from the Committee on Political Parties and Inter-Party Relations, echoes the general sentiments of the opposition and other stakeholders as well as the international community. While it is easy to raise submissions, the actual implementation of the recommendation is what will show whether communication has taken place. From the source to the receiver, a stimulus passes through a channel and is sent back to the source as illustrated in below:

Figure 5 – Communication Process
For communication to be said to have occurred there should be a demonstrable feedback either positive or negative. One of the recommendations made that there should be an Inter-Party Consultative Forum, with a Secretariat in place by the end of 2003 is yet to be seen. This makes one wonder whether the feedback is all-negative and will remain negative for all the other recommendations. There is a tendency to see a lot of negative responses than positive. This should explain the general view from the opposition that the ruling party lacks seriousness. To hold meetings with other groups and not have anything that was resolved attended to will not build up communication. When we talk of communication for development, we mean communication that brings about resolution of social conflicts and working towards reaching a consensus. It should raise people's awareness of their situation and options they have at their disposal for activities that bring development. The major ingredient of communication for development is participatory communication, which is all-inclusive.

At the moment, the public is not really aware of issues at a political level because they are not sure who is telling the truth between the opposition and the ruling party. The result is that they see political leaders as having failed them thereby losing faith in them. This is seen in poor turn out during elections and lack of interest in what is happening on the political scene. This leaves the development of good governance on a balance.

From what Huntington (1999) discussed concerning the need for sustainable democracy, the country cannot afford to go back to the system of the second republic. As Huntington explains, the future of the world is closely associated with the future of democracy. With the world moving towards globalisation, political systems that are dictatorial will lose out from the benefits of a global village.

6.3. **Interpretation of Interview Questionnaires**

Three sets of questionnaires were prepared for the ruling party, opposition parties and other stakeholders.
6.3.1. The Ruling Party

The record of only one opposition party agreeing to meet with the ruling party is a clear indicator of the rift existing with the opposition. This, however, needs to be looked at in light of other factors, some of which go back to the period before Mwanawasa came into office. This emphasises the point that communication is a process.

The relationship of the MMD with other parties has not been good and this is reflected by the negative response coming from the opposition. Those who were in the MMD but had left under contentious circumstances compound this kind of response. The underlying cause of failure to relate with such parties is personal. The individual battles of the leadership spills over to their parties. This makes it difficult to bridge the gap.

Currently, the oldest party (UNIP) is enjoying good relations with the MMD, a fact which was not the case in the 90s. This is due to the fact that the then MMD leader, Chiluba was regarded as the enemy of their then party leader, Kaunda. But due to the turn out of events where the successor of Chiluba opts to stand independent of his predecessor, UNIP has decided to work with the MMD.

President Mwanawasa has a challenge to detach himself from this patrimonial culture if he is to build the party to operate as an entity on its own without personal feelings taking the fore. Considering that he entered office on a weak footing, (got 29% of the votes), this has led to prioritising the consolidation of his political base. This is being seen in the way he is targeting individual leaders of the opposition parties with offers of government posts as a way to compromise them. And as is the case with patrimonial leadership, these people have shifted their loyalties and are now pro-MMD. Some have even defected to the MMD and re-contested for the same parliamentary seats under the ruling party’s ticket with very successful results. This is impacting negatively on the strength of the opposition in parliament as the favour has now tilted to the ruling party. The strong presence of the opposition in parliament had been a good opportunity for inter-party communication as the ruling party was going to be forced to bargain through dialogue. But as it is now, their contributions will just be vocal and nothing else.

There is need for the party in power to promote the use of the Secretary General’s office in order to ensure transparent communication takes place. Their
position on certain pertinent issues needs to be clarified and it may not necessarily be what government has taken. Take the point of party funding, they refuse to take a stand but from what the president has been quoted in the media, he is against government funding parties due to lack of resources. Going by this, it would mean the MMD would support this view of their leader.

### 6.3.2. The Opposition Parties

The life of opposition parties is quite unpredictable in the sense that their life spun is normally short. They seem to come and go, and are usually formed to settle a score. Most current parties active on the political arena are an offshoot of the ruling MMD and emerged in the later part of the Chiluba’s second term in office. Their emergence was a protest against either Chiluba’s third term bid or his choice of successor.

For the opposition, the biggest challenge is to maintain a secretariat. As the situation is now, only three have party offices that are fully operational. This makes it difficult to reduce patronage as there is too much dependence on individual members. At the same time, the organisational structure is weakened since they do not have a meeting point from which to mobilise the membership nor keep proper record of not only membership but also other administrative records to do with accounts and management.

Though their record at initiating meetings with the ruling party is poor, they do not accept blame but claim the party in power is not serious and is only interested in promoting its agenda during the meetings. This level of distrust has had negative impact to an extent where the parties view, not only the ruling party with suspicion but also other parties that relate well with the MMD. That is why their own meetings as opposition have not involved all of them attending. This is as a result of the factor of personalising party ownership. Parties seem to relate together based on individual relationships of the leadership.

For this reason, most parties are not concerned about the problems their colleagues are going through. The position on party defections and party funding is based on what the party in question perceives will serve them better now. This is done without considering long term effects of their decisions. What matters is the ‘me first now’ approach. This creates a very fragmented opposition whose influence on the
party in government is nothing to talk about. In fact, in the run up to the 2001 elections, this was the case and only the third term bid brought back the parties into focus, a set up which came to be improved with the coming in of new parties formed by former MMD leaders.

The attitude of looking at what serves the individual better than what serves the nation is what leads to magnifying trivial issues to a point where developmental concerns take a secondary place.

6.3.3. Other Stakeholders

One interesting point coming out is that while the organisations attended inter-party meetings, they are not agreed on their role each took in the meetings, even though they could have been attending the same meetings. They also do not seem in agreement on the position to take concerning government funding political parties or the reaction to take against party defections. This shows that each organisation is working independently without liaising with other stakeholders. Like political parties, their being fragmented weakens their strength such that they are not able to have lasting influence on the leadership towards promotion of good governance.

In the absence of a strong opposition on the political arena, the CSOs are supposed to ensure democratic principles are upheld. This becomes very important in-between election, as the opposition only seems to come to life during election period. The other stakeholders have a responsibility to initiate inter-party dialogue meetings, when the political parties do not want to take that onus. The history of the country's political life reveals other stakeholders intervening in inter-party wrangles and successfully bringing about an understanding. The 1991 meeting between UNIP and MMD is one such example.

The problem with most stakeholders now, is that they are heavily dependent on donors for funds, especially CSOs. This limits their area of influence as the resources received have their own conditionalities, which may not include promoting inter-party relationships.

In terms of structure, some of these organisations have weak organisational capacities and lack the necessary skill to lobby for improved communication among political parties. In fact, the issue of inter-party communication is not a priority for some of them. In the case of the trade union, it has been weakened by internal strife,
which has seen splits in the union. This is a far cry from the strength and unity exhibited in years gone by.

In order to have an impact in charting the way forward, the stakeholders need to harness their resources to work at creating an enabling environment for inter-party dialogue meetings. While the calls are being made individually there is need to form one voice and work out a framework that would lay the direction to take towards fruitful inter-party communications. Initiatives such as the OASIS Forum need to be supported by all stakeholders so that they would have one point from which to operate from. As the ZAP president confessed, CSOs and the trade unions have the ability to take over government and this would not be the first time such a thing would be happening in the world. Similarly, they have the mandate of the people to mobilise political parties to come together and reach mutual understanding.

6.4. Personal Interviews

6.4.1. Interview with Dean Mung’omba

The point emphasised by the ZAP leader over the failed inter-party talks in the MICC 1996 meetings is the lack of protocol. In this way, it would mean a break down in communication as a result of using wrong channels. Going by McQuail’s pyramid of communication, the questions that go with these levels need to be answered in order to determine the level at which communication broke down.

On who communicates to whom from the previous communication encounters, the answer is that the MMD acted as the source and the opposition and other stakeholders as receivers. The purpose was to reach mutual understanding regarding the issues of good governance. The main purpose of different groups within the whole, engaging in a communication relationship, is to bring out achievement of the overall objectives of the entire whole. In such a case, there needs to be an established channel of communication for the communication encounter to be a success. Once this protocol is not followed, the relationship breaks down.

The spirit in which the 1996 meetings were approached showed a lack of genuine concern from the ruling party. Breaking up the opportunity to develop relationships on the question of chairpersonship gives the picture that to build inter-party relationships was never the objective from the start.
6.4.2. Interview with John M. Mwanakatwe

Having worked with all three regimes, Mwanakatwe, agrees that communication is a very important norm of democracy. It is a vehicle for expression of a wide range of political views.

Political parties are also partners in development so they need to be involved in matters affecting the country, being governments in waiting, so that a gap is not created should they take over office. A smooth transition should prevail with a sense of continuation in the running of government. In a case where rivalry is created with the ruling party, when it moves out and another takes over, there is a tendency to undo everything that the previous regime put in place and new ‘solutions’ adopted oblivious of the economic implications. The problem arises due to a sense of the ruling party never planning to leave government. That is why they are never accommodating of the opposition.

Communication would help create a sense of togetherness such that issues of who should chair the meetings and how other stakeholders are to contribute will not matter. They will be taken as part of the activities to harness the resources in the country for the benefit of all.

The case of government funding political parties is being looked at in light of the economic status of the country. Zambia being classified among the low-income countries with about 80% living in poverty needs to make proper priorities. A willingness to pay for promotion of democratic principles is one priority that should not be neglected. In fact, the issue of poverty is the cause of mushrooming political parties rather than ideological differences. A number of parties have been accused of coming up at the initiation of certain individuals simply to come and split votes during elections. Some are willing to put in all their investments simply because of perceived economic gains when the seat is won. No wonder the life spun of the parties is short. They are only there during election time and when the gamble is lost, the disappear into oblivion.

The funding of the parties will need a full proof criteria and guideline on how they should operate. The numerous parties on record now are a minus on the future of plural politics. A look at the USA shows only two parties consistently in existence since the beginning of democracy in the 19th century. The country is bigger in size with a much higher population than Zambia, but still does not have problems of
parties being regionalised. Bibby, cited by Clack earlier, states that the monopoly of
the Republican and Democrat reflects structural aspects of the country's political
system as well as a special feature of the parties themselves. Among the structural
system is the aspect of funding the parties during specific activities of the presidential
campaigns. This move will mean putting certain logistics in place that ensures not just
any party takes part in the election. They need to meet certain electoral rules that
would act as a control measure. At the same time, the public will be concerned of the
financial status of individual parties, as they will want to know what is happening to
the public fund. There will be need for properly established account departments and
proper management of funds. As the situation is now, there is always blame on the
ruling party in terms of abusing government resources. The other positive
development of this is that the financial hold leaders have on the party will reduce and
this will help them become more independent when it comes to taking a stand in
matters of national interest. The leader's position will not have to be the deciding
factor instead they will need to define themselves based on the majority position.

Also, intra-party relationships would be healthy to a point where an individual
member does not toll party lines even when he/she has a divergent view. An
atmosphere of tolerance for great diversity of ideas within ranks should be the norm.
This flexibility will be reflected in the electorate's ability to split votes. This is
whereby a voter votes different candidates of different parties in the same election. In
this way, the electorates are now focussed on individual leaders rather than the party
thereby reducing the personalisation of parties.

Based on these points, it is important to have financially viable parties being
registered. Most parties we have around are grounded on the ideology of capitalism
and have no alternative to offer the country. The only thing keeping them apart is
individual disagreements, which have nothing to do with moving the country forward.
Now, parties existing to settle a score are short focussed so much so that they would
rather not see intra/inter-party talks taking place at the expense of risking their
position.

As identified by the Mwanakatwe Commission, the public expressed concern
over the promotion of tribalism and sectionalism by some political parties. This not
only affects parties but also spills over to society. Many a country is still fighting to
move towards national unity after years of genocide. To heal the scar is taking longer
than it took to create the division.
7.0. CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. Introduction

This chapter will give a summary of what this research had set out to do, what the main findings of the research is and then endeavour to give recommendations on how communication can be a benefit in improving inter-party relationships for sustainable good governance.

7.2. Communication

Communication is now being realised to be an integral part of development. Different development activities are more and more including the communication component in their development plans. The kind of communication referred to here is communication for development, which is participatory. This acknowledges the fact that one-sided communication initiatives cannot bring about positive change. Positive change would only come about were all parties are involved in the process. This only happens in a set up where the right communication tools are being used, at the right time and for the right target audience. The receivers by being involved are empowered to make effective and efficient contributions for the benefits of all involved.

But as has been revealed, this can only take place in an environment of mutual trust. From the report, the main point coming out is that the different political parties lack trust for each other and this is proving a great hindrance to all of them sitting down together and discussing issues of national development. They are at a stage were the break down in communication seems irreparable with each pointing a finger at the other and never at themselves.

This sense of distrust gives the impression that the opposition parties are the enemies of the government and not partners in development. Hence, they are not involved in the running of the country. Those from the opposition who do get involved feel obliged to defect to the ruling party or keep a very low profile in the affairs of their own parties. This misconception of opposition parties is what Saasa (2003) has earlier been reported to have stated as being caused by our cultural background. This is whereby being in opposition is seen as being hostile and disloyal to the nation.
7.2.1. Effective Communication

According to the levels of communication defined in chapter three, political parties fall under the second level – institutional/organisational. McQuail explained that each level has its own problems for research and theorising. The communication questions raised are those that formed the terms of reference for this research. In any case, effective communication starts from within. A healthy intra-party communication system translates itself to a healthy inter-party communication system, brought about by being participatory.

7.2.2. Results of Ineffective Communication

As already established, the purpose of communication is to achieve a desired goal. Without effective communication, the opportunity to achieve a desired goal is denied. In inter-party communication, the main goal is to promote the value of good governance. There can be no democracy where there is a breakdown of communication. The two are symbiotic.

The failed inter-party talks were mostly as a result of lack of trust and a desire to be the number one among the parties. The need to have an upper hand caused individual parties to take uncompromising stands that led to break up or flopping of meetings over trivial matters. It is as if each party fears to be labelled weak if they give in to the demands of the other parties.

7.2.3. How Communication Promotes Good Governance

It is the purpose of this research to prove that communication plays an integral part in promoting a democratic culture. It has been shown that the issue of communication is not just the sending of verbal or non-verbal cues and back, but more than that in the sense that it should result in moving things a positive step higher. That is why the concept of communication for development and participatory communication has been raised.

The challenge to be a communicator falls on all if they are to be effective in their endeavours. A communicator in this case is the one who will make effective use of communication tools to elaborate and conceptualise strategies in a way that will
solicit positive response from the target audience. It does not matter what tool is used — whether it is interpersonal or mass media — but whatever tool used, it has to be the best in a given circumstance to articulate the views of the sender or receiver.

Communication has to be planned in order to create a framework from which it can operate. This would ensure transparency in the communication exchange that should give way to improved relationships. The field of communication has given rise to a number of theories that can provide the basis from which the framework can be designed. The main emphasis here is that communication encounters should not be treated in a haphazard manner but should be planned for in order for them to provide for sustainable development.

Bohman’s core conditions of communication at an institutional level can help guide how to be participatory in communication.

1. To be formally and procedurally correct calls for avoiding the use of wrong channels that is the main cause of distrust and suspicion.
2. To be cognitively adequate, that is, to lay all the cards on the table. Approaching the meeting with hidden agendas is counter-productive.
3. There is need to focus on issues on which consensus and compromise can be reached. This helps to build the relationship as the communication encounter produces results. The ideal of coming with too much conditionalities at the round table creates blocks that make it difficult to dialogue.
4. There is also need to be free of ideology, as it is difficult to convert another to one’s ideas without the danger of antagonising the other. Understanding and accepting each other despite the differences is the best approach to deal with prejudices.

7.3. Recommendations

From the information gathered, the student came up with recommendations that can help improve inter-party relationships in the country. This is discussed under the various players, whose contributions would go a long way in creating sustainable democratic principles.
7.3.1. The Ruling Party

The future of inter-party communication is dependent on the party in government, as they are the ones ruling. In the past years, since the re-emergence of multi-party politics, their strength to influence the way inter-party communication meetings develop has been demonstrated.

For one thing, they need to work at changing what may be described as the ‘for versus against’ culture. There is need to promote diversity of ideas without giving the impression that the divergent views are aimed at destroying the nation.

Opposition parties need to be looked at as partners in development who are there to act as a wake up call for the party in power. In order for the opposition to be effective, they need to operate on an equal footing with the ruling party. This is why the contentious issue of party funding needs to be worked on in order to provide for an environment where the parties are given a chance to be viable. Inequality renders participatory communication obsolete because it is difficult to reach a consensus as the disadvantaged party does not have the ability and competence to enter into deliberations.

As Bunce’s second point on the generalisations of democracy points out, political leaders are central to the founding and design of democracy and to its survival or collapse. More so, if they are in government. This means the ruling party has the big challenge to keep democracy alive even when there is a crisis that endangers their hold to power.

7.3.2. Opposition Parties

One major drawback to successful inter-party meetings is the issue of conditionalities. These take prominence to the point where the participants lose their focus. If meetings are to move a step further, there is need to avoid setting up conditions, especially those that border on ideology.

The patronage system needs to be done away with and a move towards intra-party democracy promoted. Most parties, the ruling parties included, get caught up in internal wrangles at the expense of inter-party relationships. This is due to the fact that no elections are held and positions are given on the basis of material contributions of individual members. This causes the problem of factionalism. Consequently,
members who would have used their skill to strengthen the capacity of the party leave to join other parties or form their own. These further weaken the opposition camp rather than strengthen it.

The weak membership and organisational structure needs to be strengthened as well to avoid unnecessary defections that are a result of joining parties for other motives other than ideological. Government needs to look at the kind of support that can be given to the parties; financial or material, in order to improve the parties' capacity to operate professionally.

The relationships among the opposition themselves has deteriorated to a level where the initial weak position of the MMD in parliament is tilting towards them. Their lack of trust for each other needs to be worked on in order to make a formidable force. In a proper democracy, the opposition must be seen to have an influence in the affairs of the nation.

7.3.3. Other Stakeholders

7.3.3.1. CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS

The other stakeholders have proved their capability over the years in the way that they have come out to protect the country’s democracy. The challenge is to have organisations whose main agenda is to promote inter-party communication relationships rather than those who consider it a small part of their plan. This will ensure they are proactive and not reactive. At the same time, it will help ensure plans are made that focus on promoting peaceful co-existence.

As the situation is, most organisations are dependent on outside help for their programmes. This means there is no consistency in terms of organising programmes that can educate political parties and the general public on issues related to peaceful communication. They also should work together in the sense that an agreement is reached that will have them speaking the same language.

7.3.3.2. THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

These mostly work through the CSOs in terms of capacity building and material/financial help. It has been recognised that preconditions are set in the kind of
assistance that they give, some of which may not be on the receiving country’s priority list.

However, in assistance of promotions of good governance, the donors need to promote the component of communication, just as is being done in other developmental programmes.

7.3.3.3. THE PUBLIC

Most times, the public is in the dark concerning matters that affect them. Without strong CSOs and opposition parties, they do not get to understand problems of various dissenting groups. There is need to have an informed electorate so that participatory communication can be effective. This would also empower them to stand against manipulation such as blind following of a leader.

The reason why the USA democracy has survived all these years is partly due to an educated electorate. They are at a level where candidates are voted for on merit and not because of the party he/she represents. In such an environment, party defections, vote buying and other electoral malpractices can be addressed because the people will force parties to focus on developmental and not petty issues.

7.3.3.4. THE MEDIA

The power of the media as a tool for communication has been realised by the political leaders. The reason why the government is delaying enacting media laws that will improve the autonomy of the media is because of fear to lose hold on the advantage that is there in terms of media coverage. When good governance records are at their lowest, the media is used to rash out against dissenting views and their perceived perpetrators.

In all its forms, from the interpersonal to mass, the media’s independence should be promoted if it is to be an effective tool of communication. Properly utilised, the media can result into an informed electorate whose priority would be focussed on issues of governance and not personalities. This would prevent abuse of power by the leadership as they would not be able to cover up their inefficiencies.
7.3. Conclusion

This report has established that there is a poor relationship existing between and/or among political parties and has shown how improper use of communication has contributed to this state of affairs. It has shown the need to use proper communication tools in order to move towards improving inter-party relationships.

The view that inter-party communication has broken down irrevocably is not ascribed to by the student. What is needed is a proper use of communication. Admitting to the breakdown in communication is accepting the fact that the country is not being governed by democratic principles. This means the democracy that is being talked about is a sham. There needs to be communication between/among political parties to demonstrate that the country’s democracy is not just on paper.
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QUESTIONNAIRE 1 – OPPOSITION PARTIES

INTRODUCTION
My name is Salome Nakazwe, from the University of Zambia. I am carrying out a research to assess the level of inter-party communication in Zambia during President Mwanawasa’s rule. I do not represent the government or any political party. Your views will be used for purely scientific and academic purposes.
I will appreciate if you will spare a few minutes (about 10 minutes) to answer a few questions.
Please cross (X) the response of your choice.

1. Sex of interviewee:  1. M  2. F

2. Name of Political Party:
   1. FDD
   2. HP
   3. ZAP
   4. PF
   5. SDP
   6. NDP
   7. UNIP
   8. UPND

3. Period when Secretary General in named party:
   1. 1991 –1996
   2. 1997 – 2001
   3. 2002 – To Date

4. In which period was your Party formed?
   1. Before 1991
   2. 1991 –1996
   4. After 2002

5. How many official* meetings has your Party held with other political parties other than the ruling Party since 2002?
   1. None
   2. 1 – 4
   3. 5 – 9
   4. 10 and above

* By official is meant the office of the Secretary General of the Party to call for the meeting.
6. If the answer to 5 above is positive, which Parties were in attendance?
   1. The ruling party
   2. All the opposition parties
   3. Some of the opposition parties
   4. The ruling party and other opposition parties
   5. The ruling party and some opposition parties

7. What was the purpose of the meeting(s) held?
   1. Consensus building
   2. Compromise
   3. Resolution
   4. Consultation
   5. Other (Please specify) ........................................

8. How many official meetings have your Party held with the ruling MMD Party since 2001?
   1. None
   2. 1 – 4
   3. 5 – 9
   4. 10 and above

9. If the answer to 8 above is positive, what was the purpose of the meeting(s)?
   1. Consensus building
   2. Compromise
   3. Resolution
   4. Consultation
   5. Other (Please specify) ........................................

10. Who initiated the meeting(s) mentioned in 9?
    1. Our Party
    2. MMD
    3. Other (Please specify) ........................................

11. Where was it held?
    1. State House
    2. MMD Headquarters
    3. Our Party Headquarters

12. Has your Party made official attempts to meet with the ruling Party?
    1. Yes
    2. No
6. If the answer to 5 above is positive, which Parties were in attendance?
   1. The ruling party
   2. All the opposition parties
   3. Some of the opposition parties
   4. The ruling party and other opposition parties
   5. The ruling party and some opposition parties

7. What was the purpose of the meeting(s) held?
   1. Consensus building
   2. Compromise
   3. Resolution
   4. Consultation
   5. Other (Please specify).................................

8. How many official meetings have your Party held with the ruling MMD Party since 2001?
   1. None
   2. 1 – 4
   3. 5 – 9
   4. 10 and above

9. If the answer to 8 above is positive, what was the purpose of the meeting(s)?
   1. Consensus building
   2. Compromise
   3. Resolution
   4. Consultation
   5. Other (Please specify).................................

10. Who initiated the meeting(s) mentioned in 9?
    1. Our Party
    2. MMD
    3. Other (Please specify).................................

11. Where was it held?
    1. State House
    2. MMD Headquarters
    3. Our Party Headquarters

12. Has your Party made official attempts to meet with the ruling Party?
    1. Yes
    2. No
13. If the answer to 12 above is No, give reasons.
   1. Still in pipeline
   2. Not interested
   3. Channel used was not official (Please specify).................
   4. Other (Please specify)........................................

14. Has the ruling Party made official attempts to meet with your Party?
   1. Yes        2. No

15. If the answer to 14 above is Yes, what has been your Party's response?

16. If the answer to 15 above is No, give reasons.
   1. Still in pipeline
   2. Not interested
   3. Channel was not official (Please specify)....................
   4. Other (Please specify)........................................

17. Has your Party held official meetings with the ruling MMD prior to 2001
   1. Yes        2. No        3. Not sure

18. If answer to 17 above is Yes, what was the purpose of the meeting(s)?
   1. Consensus building
   2. Compromise
   3. Resolution
   4. Consultation
   5. Other (Please specify)........................................

19. Where was the venue for the meeting(s)?
   1. State House
   2. MMD Headquarters
   3. Our Party Headquarters

20. Who initiated the meeting(s)
   1. Our Party
   2. MMD
   3. Other (Please specify)........................................

21. Did your Party contribute to the Agenda of the said meetings?
   1. Yes    2. No

22. Does your Party have representation in Parliament?
   1. Yes    2. No
23. If answer to 22 is Yes how many of your MPs have defected to other Parties?
   1. None   2. 1 – 3   3. 4 – 6   4. Above 6

24. How has been your Party’s reaction to the defections?
   1. Disappointed with the receiving Party
   2. Attempted to dialogue with the receiving Party
   3. Accepted the situation as the better Party winning
   4. Push for Constitution changes so defectors do not stand for a Parliamentary seat until a given number of years has elapsed.
   5. Others (Please specify)..............................

25. Should government fund all Parties? 1. Yes, all of them 2. No, not one
    3. Yes, only those with representation in Parliament


27. How many full time employees does your Party have?
   1. None   2. 1 – 5   3. 6 – 10   4. Above 10

28. In your own words briefly propose what should be done to improve inter-party relationships?

...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – THE RULING PARTY

INTRODUCTION
My name is Salome Nakazwe, from the University of Zambia. I am carrying out a research to assess the level of inter-party communication in Zambia during President Mwanawasa’s rule. I do not represent the government or any political party. Your views will be used for purely scientific and academic purposes.
I will appreciate if you will spare a few minutes (about 15 minutes) to answer a few questions.

Please cross (X) the response of your choice.
1. Sex of interviewee: 1. M  2. F
2. Period when Secretary General in the Party:
   1. 1991 –1996
   2. 1997 – 2001
   3. 2002 –To Date
3. How many official† meetings has your Party held with other Political Parties since 2002?
   1. None
   2. 1 – 4
   3. 5 – 9
   4. 10 and above
4. What was the purpose of the meeting(s)?
   1. Consensus building
   2. Compromise
   3. Resolution
   4. Consultation
   5. Other (Please specify).................................
5. Which Parties were in attendance?
   1. All the opposition parties
   2. Some of the opposition parties
   3. Other stakeholders (Please specify)........................

† By official is meant using the office of the Secretary General of the Party to call for the meeting.
6. How many of such meeting(s) were initiated by your Party?
   1. None
   2. 1 – 4
   3. 5 – 9
   4. 10 and above

7. How many unofficial meetings has your Party held with the opposition since 2002?
   1. Not Sure
   2. Few
   3. A lot
   4. None

8. Has the ruling Party attempted to meet together with all the opposition parties together?
   1. Yes
   2. No

9. If answer to 8 above is Yes put a cross against a party that gave a positive response:
   1. FDD
   2. HP
   3. PF
   4. SDP
   5. NLD
   6. UNIP
   7. UPND
   8. ZRP
   9. NDP
   10. OTHER (Please specify)

10. What is the position of MMD on government funding all political parties?
    1. In favour
    2. Against the idea
    3. Has taken no position

11. Does your Party own any assets? 1. Yes
    2. No

12. How many full time employees does your Party have?
    1. None
    2. 1 – 5
    3. 6 – 10
    4. 11 – 15
    5. Above 15

13. In your own word briefly propose what should be done to improve inter-party relationships?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
QUESTIONNAIRE 3 – OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

INTRODUCTION
My name is Salome Nakazwe, from the University of Zambia. I am carrying out a research to assess the level of inter-party communication in Zambia during President Mwanawasa’s rule. I do not represent the government or any political party. Your views will be used for purely scientific and academic purposes.
I will appreciate if you will spare a few minutes (about 15 minutes) to answer a few questions.

Please cross ( X) the response of your choice.

1. Sex of interviewee: 1. M  2. F

2. Name of organisation
   1. ZCTU
   2. ZEC
   3. CCZ
   4. EFZ
   5. NGOCC
   6. FODEP
   7. SACCORD
   8. ZIMT
   9. AFRONET
   10. INTER-PARTY CAUCUS

3. Position in the Organisation:

4. Period when in this position
   1. Before 1991
   2. 1991 –1996
   4. After 2002

5. In which period was your Organisation formed?
   1. Before 1991
   2. 1991 –1996
   4. After 2002

6. Has your Organisation initiated any inter-party communications since 2001?
   1. Yes
   2. No

7. If answer to 6 above is Yes, what has been the result?
   1. Positive
   2. Negative
8. Has your Organisation attended any official meeting between/among political parties?
   1. Yes   2. No

9. If answer to 8 above is Yes, what was the purpose of the meeting(s)?
   1. Consensus building
   2. Compromise
   3. Resolution
   4. Consultation
   5. Other (Please specify)

10. What role did your Organisation perform in the meeting(s)?
    1. Facilitator
    2. Mediator
    3. Participant
    4. Consultant
    5. Other (Please specify)

11. Prior to 2001, has your Organisation attended any inter-party meetings organised for all political parties?
    1. Yes   2. No   3. Not sure

12. If the answer to 11 above is Yes, what was the purpose of the meeting(s)
    1. Consensus building
    2. Compromise
    3. Resolution
    4. Consultation
    5. Other (Please specify)

13. What was the role of the organisation in this meeting(s)?
    1. Facilitator
    2. Mediator
    3. Participant
    4. Consultant
    5. Other (Please specify)

14. Did your Party contribute to the Agenda of the said meetings?
    1. Yes   2. No

---

1 By official is meant using the office of the Secretary General of the Party to call for the meeting.
15. If the answer to 11 above is No, what is the reason?
   1. Was not part of our agenda
   2. The political climate did not allow
   3. We had no resources
   4. Other (Please specify)..........................

16. What has been your Organisation’s reaction to Party defections?
   1. Lobby for change of Constitution to bar defectors from standing for MP for a given period
   2. Seen it as a good indicator of democratic governance
   3. Released statements to condemn the act
   4. Other (please specify)..........................

17. Do you believe that funding political parties will contribute to improve inter-party relations? 1. Yes 2. No

18. In your own words briefly propose what should be done to improve inter-party relationships:

.................................................................................................................................
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Appendix IV

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW WITH MR DEAN MUNG’OMBA

INTRODUCTION

My name is Salome Nakazwe, from the University of Zambia. I am carrying out a research to assess the level of inter-party communication in Zambia during President Mwanawasa’s rule. I do not represent the government or any political party. Your views will be used for purely scientific and academic purposes.

I will appreciate if you will spare some time to answer a few questions.

1. Who was your present in the inter-party dialogue your party was involved in during former President Chiluba’s regime?
2. Would you describe the meeting as a success?
3. What was the main theme of the meeting where the ruling party was involved?
4. Who called for the meeting?
5. Did the meeting among just the opposition parties achieve the desired goal?
6. How do you look at communication as an important aspect in promoting democratic governance?
7. How do you see the patrimonial behaviour in parties affecting communication within, between or among political parties?
8. What is your comment on the recent Indaba in relation to inter-party relationships?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW WITH MR JOHN M. MWANAKATWE

INTRODUCTION

My name is Salome Nakazwe, from the University of Zambia. I am carrying out a research to assess the level of inter-party communication in Zambia during President Mwanawasa’s rule. I do not represent the government or any political party. Your views will be used for purely scientific and academic purposes.

I will appreciate if you will spare some time to answer a few questions.

1. What is your current position in life?
2. Do you think inter-party communication is an indicator of democracy in a country?
3. What issues should political parties discuss?
4. How often should parties meet to discuss these issues?
5. Who should chair inter-party meetings?
6. What is your position on government funding political parties in the country?
7. Do you think Party Presidents with representation in parliament being given government positions as a good measure to promote inter-party relations?
8. Do you think parties should first prove their financial capability before being registered? Give reason for your answer.
9. When you chaired the CRC, what major issues were raised concerning inter-party relationship?
10. Do you see much of the recommendations you made being adhered to now? If so, in what way?
11. How do you compare the Kaunda regime (First Republic), Chiluba regime and Mwanawasa regime in terms of how they relate(d) to the opposition political parties and civil society in general?
12. What do you see as the way forward for inter-party relationships in the country?
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