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Youth and Politics in Conflict Contexts is the result of a conference held at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars on May 16, 2007, and hosted by the Wilson Center’s Project on Leadership and Building State Capacity in collaboration with the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. The conference examined the diverse ways in which youth contribute to sustainable peace through active involvement in politics. The first panel examined the role of youth in building and strengthening democratic institutions in specific contexts including Bosnia and Kenya. The second panel explored young peoples’ involvement in elections monitoring and civic education campaigns during the 2005 elections in Liberia and assessed the youth agenda in Liberia today. The report was coordinated and edited by Georgina Petrosky and Sarah Cussen of the Leadership Project and project intern Libby Hubbard.

The presentations contained in this report are based on the transcription of the speakers’ comments during the conference and have been edited for print with the consent of the authors.
The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization working in 60 countries around the world to encourage and engage people in the political process through political parties, legislatures, elections, and civil society. NDI is committed to engaging young people and believes that if constructively engaged, youth can serve as catalysts for change, and can play an important role in the resolution and prevention of conflict.

Today, many citizens, governments, and representatives of the international community often view young people as part of the problem and not as part of the solution, particularly in countries that are on the verge of or are emerging from conflict. In many of these societies, youth are marginalized and have little voice in the political processes, which in large part contributes to their frustration. Too often, government and elected officials do not engage young citizens or encourage them to participate in politics. When young people do try to express their political wishes, government officials often overlook youths’ specific concerns like access to education and employment. The isolation of youth and the perception that their problems go largely ignored leads to frustration and, tragically, can lead to violence and conflict.

However, in many places, when youth are provided access to skills, training, and encouragement, they can effectively and constructively engage in their communities and politics. Young people can contribute significantly, as a result of their energy, eagerness, cutting-edge ideas, knowledge of technology, and willingness to take risks, as represented the youth contributors in this publication. In this way, youth can come to view themselves as partners in the process, stakeholders in securing peace, and agents for positive change.

In the last 20 years, NDI has worked in 18 post-conflict countries. In almost every country that has emerged from civil war, NDI has assisted in creating a new political system, rebuilding political parties, and creating new constitutions, electoral laws, and frameworks that allow people to participate equitably in the political process. Currently, however, the greatest challenge is in countries on the verge of conflict that are characterized by ethnic divisions, religious differences, and an ever-growing disparity between rich and poor. Nigeria, Pakistan, and Nepal are examples of countries in which conflict mitigation is the priority and one of the possible keys to the solution is to engage youth in those countries.

NDI is not alone in supporting the active engagement of young people in countries at risk of violent conflict or emerging from conflict. However, there has been limited discussion on the topic, and greater attention needs to be given to developing effective mechanisms and tools to positively approach and engage youth. This publication provides a venue to discuss these issues and is part of a larger NDI effort to develop case studies and a toolkit to help guide youth programming.

“Our answer is the world’s hope; it has to rely on youth...It cannot be moved by those who cling to a present which is already dying, who prefer the illusion of security to the excitement of danger. This world demands the qualities of youth; not a time of life, but a state of mind, a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a predominance of courage over timidity.”

—Robert F. Kennedy, “Day of Affirmation Address.”
University of Capetown, Capetown, South Africa. 6 June 1966.
Conflict-sensitive programming has been a priority for the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) in recent years. However, while USAID is committed to responding effectively to violence and its aftermath, the international community must be more effective in addressing the issues that lead to widespread violence, pervasive instability, and extremism. Young people, particularly young men, who are uprooted, alienated, unemployed, and have few opportunities for positive engagement, represent a ready pool of recruits for extremist groups or those who have violent agendas. Several categories of young people appear to be particularly at risk: unemployed university graduates, young people who have moved from rural to urban areas, and youth who have lived through internal conflicts.

Young people often participate in violence because limited avenues for constructive political participation exist. Equally, youth prioritize employment and, as they put it, “If you give us something to do, we won’t have any need to disrupt life.” In Nepal, for example, if youth are not included in the peace process and if they do not see concrete changes, they can become potential spoilers to the Nepali peace process. In fact, as noted by Population Action International in a 2003 report entitled The Security Demographic, the youth bulge is positively correlated to political volatility, and countries in which more than 40 percent of the adult population is aged 15 to 29 are more than twice as likely to experience the outbreak of civil conflict, particularly since the 1990s.

To address these issues, USAID has been shifting attention to at-risk youth and is currently funding a broad range of training, employment, and political-participation programs around the globe and particularly in countries that have been identified as at risk of instability. Consequently, today’s discussion is both timely and necessary to challenge the international community’s perception of youth and explore how young people can become positive political actors.
Bosnia and Herzegovina (BH) is a country in the southeast part of Europe situated in the west of the Balkan Peninsula. It is situated across the Adriatic Sea from Italy, bordering Croatia in the north and Serbia and Montenegro in the east. The capital is Sarajevo. Bosnia’s population is approximately 4,500,000 with nearly one in two people living in urban areas and the three major nationalities are Bosniaks, Serbs, and Croats.

Bosnia was an independent state for a thousand years before becoming part of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1918 and later a republic in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). In March 1992, BH declared independence, gaining international recognition. However, shortly after, on April 6, 1992, the neighboring countries, including the rump state of Yugoslavia and the regime of Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, carried out armed aggression against BH.

During the three-and-a-half-year-long war, the international community initially only observed the armed conflict in BH. However, after several futile attempts at making peace, in 1995 the international community finally helped to secure the signing of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in BH in Dayton, Ohio. Among the signatories to the agreement were the presidents of the SFRY (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Republic of Croatia who had carried out the armed aggression against the sovereign and internationally recognized country of BH.

During the war, ethnic cleansing and mass destruction were systematically carried out by the paramilitary forces of the Army of the Republic of Srpska and the regime from Belgrade against the citizens of BH who were Muslims or Catholics. The prevalence of mass war crimes during the conflict resulted in intense insecurity and instability in the post-war period. The verdict of the International Court of Justice in The Hague confirmed that Serbia, during the presidency of the war criminal Slobodan Milosevic, broke the United Nations Convention on Genocide because it failed to prevent the criminal offence of genocide against Bosnian Muslims.

Today, Bosnia and Herzegovina is a state with a unique political system, different from any other. Many domestic and foreign politicians say that BH is composed of two entities, the Muslim-Croat Federation and the Republic of Srpska, as well as a federal district governed locally; however, it is not a country made of independent federal units but rather is a reflection of the 1992 demarcations.

The complexity of the constitutional regulations in BH requires an enormous administrative apparatus that takes 60 to 65 percent of Bosnia’s gross national product to operate, resulting in higher taxes than in other European countries. The high taxes burden the already complex political, economic, and social situation in the state. Furthermore, the educational system was inherited from socialist Yugoslavia and the situation is made even more complex by the desire of some of the Bosnian Serb population to retain political power and control over education by attempting to obstruct the adoption of the Educational Law that aims to achieve European standards in education. The state does not have the funds to put into capital investments, science and technology initiatives, or training programs that could equip the population with the tools needed to carry out the long-expected process of European integration. In fact, only three percent of BH citizens have university diplomas. It is not hard to imagine, therefore, that more than 70 percent of young people say they want to leave BH.

Young people make up approximately 23 percent of the population of the country, and hypothetically, they could have a significant role in the country’s political and economic development through elections and other civic activities. However, deep divisions, based on nationality, religion, and ethnicity, exist among youth and have been reinforced by discriminatory electoral laws. These divisions, coupled with the complexity of the state apparatus and lack of services for youth, create apathy and reluctance among youth to participate in political life. For example, only one percent of young people in BH...
think that they have influence over the political events in the country, and only a small number of them are involved in the new, rising generation of political parties, whereas more prefer to work in the non-governmental sector.

In BH, the international community, led by the high representative, is still dominant. The high representative has numerous executive powers and responsibilities including the mandate to remove anyone from office who violates provisions of the General Framework Agreement for Peace. Additional international organizations are needed in BH to facilitate the process of democratization and to strengthen the role of young people in the transition period, especially in integrating young people in socio-political life.

Training programs for the education of young people on politics and parliamentary procedure, such as those of NDI, are essential in engaging and supporting young people and equipping them with the practical knowledge and skills to become relevant actors in the political arena. Through such programs, the diverse roles of youth are protected and promoted, and youth are encouraged to explore issues related to integration, equality, and anti-discriminatory politics.

My election to the Parliament of the Federation of BH as a member of the Stranka za BH (SBH) political party is evidence of how political parties are becoming increasingly aware of the benefits of engaging young people in politics as a progressive force in the structure of BH society. SBH is founded on the principles of equality and respect for human rights, and the party enables young people to enroll and actively participate in public, political, and social life, with the aim of helping preserve and ensure for young people, as well as for other generations, a healthy environment in BH and the region.

Future generations of young people should envision the development of Bosnia and carry that image in their minds and hearts for years to come. They should not be burdened by the past; rather they should be encouraged because young people are capable of defining the present and the future. Therefore, the direction of the country will be determined by progressive youth.
At independence in 1963, Kenya’s youth assumed power from the outgoing colonialists. Since then, these same leaders have continued to dominate the political scene. President Kibaki, who is now 75 years old, has been a powerful political figure since he became the Executive Officer of the Kenyan African National Union (KANU) at the age of 31. The political environment in Kenya has therefore not been conducive to youth participation, and this has been detrimental to the generations that have followed since independence. Consequently, youth have had to face many challenges in their bid to find relevance in Kenya’s politics.

CHALLENGES TO YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN KENYAN POLITICS

The slow evolution of the democratic culture in Kenya has been the first major challenge to the participation of youth in the political process. In 1991, Kenya embraced multiparty democracy by repealing section 2A of the constitution. However, it was not until 2002 that the meaning of this concept began to be realized. In the years between, Kenya was a multi-party state by law but a single-party state in practice. The political environment was stifling for anyone outside the government, especially youth. Youth only participated in political activities when KANU recruited them into the KANU Youth Wingers, an unstructured organization composed of stone throwers, hecklers, and youth engaged in anti-social behavior. It was nearly impossible for youth to be positively engaged in contributing their ideas or different points of view on any matter.

A second major challenge is that many Kenyans assume that the younger the person, the less prepared he or she is to deal with the mechanics of policy formulation and governance issues. The “youth” label is synonymous with political incompetence. Consequently, the definition of youth has changed over the years, often to accommodate political interests. For example, during the KANU regime, from 1963 to 2002, anyone under 50 was considered a youth in order to validate the authority of the older politicians who had been in power longer. However, the most recent definition accepted by the current government defines a youth as a person aged 35 or younger.

A third obstacle to the effective participation of youth in political leadership is the unequal distribution of resources. Most young people do not have the basic resources to mount a campaign for elected office; or if they do, either their party rejects them in favor of an older, moneyed competitor or youth volunteers prefer to work for more prosperous candidates. In my own experience, I ran for a parliamentary seat in 2002 and lost the bid to an older competitor on the basis of age and money, despite the fact that I had developed an agenda for action and my competitor had not.

A fourth factor that often impedes the effective involvement of youth in political leadership is ignorance. Young voters’ lack of understanding of the issues can cause them to become either angry and violent or apathetic and disinterested in the candidates. Regrettably, not all the negative images of youth are unfounded. Some young people who have been entrusted with leadership positions have contributed to the negative image of youth. Age alone cannot be the quintessential measure of good leadership. Unfortunately, Kenya lacks the institutional structure evident in the United States that would afford a level of order within the political process and would allow young people to function independently within the system while holding them accountable.

Finally, without a properly defined and predictable procedure on issues such as internal party nominations, processes, and elections, among other topics, elections become chaotic, and the less-connected party...
members, especially youth, get marginalized in the political process. At the party level, just as at the national level, youth are often viewed as being inadequately prepared for political leadership until they can prove otherwise. Therefore, in addition to the usual challenges of political leadership, young people must also grapple with the cultural stereotypes and prove their validity.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH INVOLVEMENT IN KENYAN POLITICS**

Despite the various challenges facing youth in politics, the political environment in Kenya is increasingly receptive to youth engagement and the government is making an effort to empower youth. Similarly, political parties are moving away from mere rhetoric to actually providing leadership opportunities for young people. For example, within the FORD-People party, 7 of the 30 National Executive Committee members are below the age of 35.

Recognizing the relationship between political power and the distribution of the country’s resources, Kenyan youth have always viewed the political process as an effective way of addressing their needs, which is why they have continued their struggle to secure political participation. In fact, the 2007 elections may have a bigger number of aspiring youth candidates than ever before, though their ability to survive the party nominations remains to be seen. More young people are stepping into the political arena because they feel the need to change the way things are done. It has become increasingly common to find youth seeking elected positions, occupying leadership positions in political parties and other organizations, engaging in political debates, or taking part in political activism. In fact, while the political field has historically been dominated by male youth, and in most cases, urban, educated male youth, diversity is increasing as young women step forward in larger numbers to take part and young leaders encourage rural youth to get involved.

**YOUTH LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS**

The efforts of many non-governmental organizations and agencies, including NDI, have contributed significantly to the empowerment of youth by focusing attention on young people and providing opportunities for them to learn more about politics and political leadership. Civic education and political skills acquisition are extremely important elements of leadership. If youth want to become involved in politics, they need to understand basic concepts such as strategic planning, goal setting, and agenda development. In addition, it is important for young leaders to question assumptions made about their leadership potential and begin to reach out to each other across tribal or political lines.

However, many Kenyan youth are not familiar with the concept of collaboration, and in fact, their relationships with members of other political parties are often defined by intolerance, suspicion, skepticism, and even violence. Training programs that bring together youth from different political parties have to address these issues and focus on teaching communication and conflict-resolution skills. Many of the hurdles that youth face regarding political involvement are often the result of ignorance. Without training, young people are more likely to base their actions on wrong assumptions, act out of impatience, remain intolerant of opposing views, and fail to strategically build their political leadership capacities. However, training programs such as NDI’s Leadership Academy have shown that leadership can be taught. Youth come away from these programs with an understanding that it is important to listen to all perspectives before coming to a conclusion, and that there is value in working together towards a common purpose.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Future activities aimed at improving the participation of youth in political leadership should prioritize leadership training with an emphasis on management skills and accountability so that when elected, young politicians can continue to play an important role in inspiring others to participate in politics. Second, “youth for youth” role models should be encouraged. As more youth gain leadership positions in political parties, it is important that they help to educate other young people. Finally, political party procedures should be standardized and institutionalized in order to create predictable legal and constitutional frameworks that would enable hardworking, determined, and committed youth to navigate the political system.
Definitions of youth vary widely across cultures. The term “youth” usually pertains to anyone younger than 30. However, in some contexts, it is extended to include even people in their forties. The first youth delegate to the General Assembly for Bangladesh, for example, was 35 at the time. If youth is defined by potential and adulthood by experience, I was once told, then anyone can be youthful as long as their potential outweighs their experience. Young people need leadership opportunities to be able to gain experience and fulfill their potential. It is important, therefore, to integrate young people at the helm of both the political and non-profit sectors.

Recognizing that young people, like all people, want to be appreciated for the role that they play in society, they need viable avenues through which they can use their abilities and talents to make positive contributions. Many young people look for opportunities or try to create opportunities for participation, only to find their ideas resisted or rejected. In the absence of such opportunities, they are more likely to find other avenues of expression and alternative groups in which to feel a sense of belonging. The result of our failure to constructively engage them is that their potential is often lost or diverted. If young people are not given viable means of participation, they can be engaged by anybody who will make them feel valued and appreciated, including extremist groups.

Youth are important political actors. However, the naturally partisan nature of political organizations and political parties can encourage unnecessary competition and division among young actors. Therefore, the most important and effective way to engage young people in decision-making at the country level is through national youth councils, which provide an umbrella for diverse perspectives. National youth councils are often most effective when they are comprised of members representing local or municipal youth councils, because it is ultimately in local settings that youth are able to have the greatest impact in their own communities. Some of the most progressive countries also have strong national-level structures that engage young people in formulating policy, designing and evaluating educational programs, and creating new policies, programs, or funds specifically designed to assist young people. The most effective programs give youth a voice at all levels of society.

John F. Kennedy said that the future prospects of any nation depend on the current prospects of its youth. This is a particularly useful perspective when looking at conflict countries. Unfortunately, there are no fewer wars going on today than when the United Nations was founded over 60 years ago. Recognizing that over half the world’s population is currently under age 25, and that youth represent the bulk of the armed forces in any country, young people have been disproportionately affected by conflict. However, there is still room for hope because, over the past decade, a powerful, progressive force to involve youth in decision-making processes has gained momentum in both the political and non-governmental arenas.

Although the United Nations and other international organizations have long been talking about the importance of young people’s participation, only now are we beginning to see the momentum to create new and more effective opportunities for young people. For example, UN agencies are increasingly inquisitive about how to effectively engage young people as real actors in their programs. Recently, several major reports, including the “World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation” by the World Bank, have focused on youth. Interestingly, the World Development Report built upon the previous “United Nations World Youth Report 2005,” which presented the case for developing national youth policies. That report was timed to coincide with the ten-year review of the
World Program of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond. The 1995 World Program of Action for Youth was a follow-up to the International Year of Youth, which the United Nations designated in 1985 to mark the 20th anniversary of the 1965 UN “Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples.” This chronology highlights a clear longstanding desire to see stronger youth engagement.

In the past decade, largely as a result of the Internet, the number of youth organizations created has grown exponentially, and there are now tens, if not hundreds of thousands of youth organizations, networks, campaigns, and initiatives in existence. There are probably more young people involved in social activism today than ever before in history. However, there have been very few connecting forces between these groups. Young people have been trying to positively impact their communities and their countries, but continue to lack the institutional, governmental, financial, and media support necessary for their efforts to succeed. The Global Youth Action Network (GYAN) connects youth organizations around the world because of its belief that they have the potential to work together en masse as agents of positive change.

GYAN set out to create a clearinghouse where organizations can come to learn from each other, to access information and other resources, and to create communication channels that support collaboration among them. Through GYAN, members have minimized redundancy, created more support for youth action, and worked together to leverage their efforts more effectively. The belief is that perhaps this generation can affect the kind of change that the United Nations has been talking about for the past 60 years.

Especially in conflict or post-conflict settings, young people can and should be engaged in their community’s development at every level, from volunteering to policy formation. There are a couple of examples where young people have been empowered to participate actively and effectively in the political process in Afghanistan and Sierra Leone. In 2002, a youth-led organization in Afghanistan convened young leaders and government representatives in a national youth roundtable series, at which young people were able to discuss the real policy changes they wanted during reconstruction. Similarly, in Sierra Leone, a former child soldier helped to engage his peers, other child soldiers, in artistic and cultural activities. These gave young people meaningful involvement and a sense of belonging.

Recognizing that we have not succeeded in saving “succeeding generations from the scourge of war” in the past 60 years, we don’t have much to lose by involving youth more effectively today. Not to engage their energy, idealism and fresh perspective is a failure to leave the world better for future generations, and to employ new ways of solving old problems. It was Einstein, after all, who reminded us that problems cannot be solved with the same thinking that created them.
In January 2006, the democratic world watched with respect as the people of Liberia ushered in a new, democratically elected government headed by Africa’s first female president, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. After many decades of misrule intensified by 14 years of killing and political corruption, the National Youth Movement for Transparent Elections (NAYMOTE) led a campaign to bring about increased, informed participation of young people in the governance processes. NAYMOTE stimulated citizen interest in the electoral process and raised awareness about the importance of voting wisely by launching a country-wide, civic-education campaign that promoted increased representation of women, youth, the elderly, and the disabled. As a result, over 54.6 percent of young registered voters participated in the election.

THE PRE-ELECTION CONTEXT

NAYMOTE’s civic-education effort started in 2001 with a campaign to sensitize citizens, including youth and students, on the importance of freely exercising their constitutional right to vote. To better understand the electorate, NAYMOTE initiated a number of surveys to inform its campaign programs. The surveys indicated that Liberians were strongly in favor of a significant change in the governance system. Additionally, the surveys revealed that ex-combatants were poised to engage in violence; that women, particularly rural women, had minimal political interest; and that there existed a high level of doubt among the general public that the National Elections Commission would be able to successfully administer the election process in a transparent, independent, and impartial manner. The overwhelming perspective among the general public was that external forces with deep-seated interests would manipulate the election process irrespective of how the people voted, and therefore, that the elections would be largely ceremonial. Consequently, many citizens, including youth, had decided not to vote as they didn’t believe that their participation would make any difference to the election outcome or that the elected government would be any different than the one before.

In the 1997 elections, thousands of young people adopted the slogan, “You kill my ma, you kill my pa, I will vote for you,” and overwhelmingly voted warlord Charles Taylor into power. It became obvious how vulnerable the youth were to manipulation by politicians with money who used material incentives to win the youth vote. In 2005, therefore, NAYMOTE launched intensive pre-election campaigns in Monrovia and rural Liberia to educate and inform citizens, particularly youth, on how to elect competent and credible individuals who would foster reconciliation, justice, development, and citizen empowerment.

CIVIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGNS

The campaigns enlisted the full involvement, interest, and support of young people by making evident the link between voting and political empowerment. Specifically, the campaigns were directed at helping youth understand that the ballots they cast were directly related to the future they desired, and therefore, they had the ability to positively shape their future by making wise choices. To overcome
voter apathy, NAYMOTE developed a public-education campaign, quickly building consensus among youth by informing them that the elections presented the last opportunity for Liberians to redeem their country, which was embarrassingly referred to as a “failed state.” Campaign messages that emphasized, “This is your last chance!” resonated with youth.

Throughout the education campaign, NAYMOTE recruited and trained youth volunteers and deployed them as civic educators in their respective schools and communities. Most of the youth who became civic educators were out-of-school youth, ex-combatants, disabled youth, and students who gained increased ownership of the campaign and became more active participants in the electoral process as a result of the program. In fact, these youth led the “Get Out to Vote” campaign that was held in Montserrado, Bong, Nimba, and Grand Bassa counties and was funded by NDI. During the “Get Out to Vote” campaign, the civic educators visited homes, coffee shops, schools, and communities to educate citizens about the electoral process by providing information on where and when and how to register and encouraging them to vote wisely and peacefully.

In an effort to raise awareness on critical issues affecting the electoral process, NAYMOTE interviewed candidates and issued press statements that clearly stated the need to provide all candidates with the opportunity to participate equally in the electoral process. Additionally, NAYMOTE cautioned potential contestants, many of whom were former warlords or incumbents accused of looting state resources, against using government resources for their personal campaigns. It was made clear that such action would be in violation of the Liberian electoral law and the principle of competitive, free, fair, and democratic elections. NAYMOTE also organized and conducted candidate debates through which youth were able to screen and assess different candidates and make more informed decisions about who to vote for. In this way, the debates supported the campaign phrase, “Know, Choose, and Vote,” and motivated youth to focus on political issues and denounce violence.

ELECTIONS MONITORING
The National Committee for Elections Monitoring, a coalition of which NAYMOTE was a part, recruited, trained, and deployed approximately 500 domestic elections monitors to help deter fraud by reporting irregularities to the electoral body, and encouraging peaceful conduct across the country. The domestic elections-monitoring initiative promoted local ownership, boosted citizen participation and confidence in the electoral processes, and reinforced the credibility of the elections from voter registration to the tabulation and announcement of the results.

LESSONS LEARNED
The 2005 elections saw increased youth interest in the political process, evidenced by the fact that youth constituted an overwhelming majority of registered voters. In fact, of the total number of 1.3 million registered voters, 54.6 percent were young people, which is an unprecedented accomplishment in Liberia’s checkered history of electioneering. These results made evident that youth can be mobilized easily when they are informed of the issues addressed by the election process and when they understand the connection between these issues and their needs. Specifically, they are more likely to stay involved when they understand that their interests, growth, and empowerment depend on their positive and constructive participation in the elections. Additionally, youth involvement can be sustained by engaging them in the planning and implementation of programs and activities. For example, some of the best ways to reach out and engage youth are in coffee shops and through organizing sports and entertainment activities. However, while youth who participated in the 2005 elections have indicated their interest in remaining engaged in the governance processes, limited resources and access to information remain a fundamental concern.

LOOKING FORWARD
In the post-election era, the elected officials in the executive and legislative branches have demonstrated increased transparency and commitment to the democratic tenets of the constitution. NAYMOTE Youth Networks are now focused on developing and implementing various program activities such as town hall meetings and voter outreach to hold elected officials accountable to their campaign promises.
NAYMOTE’s post-election programs have helped bridge the information gap that can paralyze young people’s active participation in the governance processes. Through public education campaigns, civic forums, youth leadership debates, and school and community forums, groups like NAYMOTE assist youth in developing the confidence to participate in public debates, in broadening their knowledge and understanding of government structures and functions, and in promoting their regular interaction with policymakers and government officials. This approach to youth engagement can be further enhanced by encouraging youth to share their experiences at conferences and trainings, expanding programs to additional countries, networking with other organizations, and publishing reports that reflect program impacts.
THE LIBERIAN CONTEXT

The Liberian National Youth Policy (NYP) is one of the biggest and boldest steps taken in support of young peoples’ social and political engagement in Liberian history. Traditionally, Liberia has been defined by two cultures: the Americo-Liberians who migrated as freed slaves from the United States and the West Indies, and the indigenous peoples. Today, Liberia is defined predominantly by the urban, more Westernized areas, and the rural areas that are steeped in local culture and tradition. In order to avoid generalization, the divided reality of Liberia is important to take into consideration when discussing national policies such as the NYP.

It is also important to recognize that traditionally, youth in Liberia were considered children and were not allowed to participate in adult activities and conversations. The elders in the community were the authority figures, decision-makers, and power-brokers. They had the ability to cast judgment, to divide land or take it away, and to restore an individual back into the community. The youth had no voice. However, during the wars, a significant power shift occurred. Children as young as seven years old had possession of AK-47s and rocket-propelled grenades. The power of life and death lay in the hands of children and youth who now had authority over the elders. The resulting struggle in the post-war period has been and continues to be the establishment of the most effective governance structure that does not revert back to the former hierarchy, but still appreciates elders for their value-added while incorporating young people as resources for peacebuilding and development. Consequently, the power structure in Liberia is in transition, and the fact that there currently exists such active discourse concerning youth engagement is a testimony to how far the country has progressed.

OVERVIEW OF YOUTH POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

Prior to 1990, when the first civil war officially started, youth political engagement in Liberia essentially centered on the University of Liberia Student Union (ULSU) and the Federation of Liberian Youth (FLY). Youth mobilization around politics and social issues outside of those two groups was limited and unstructured. In fact, the FLY’s activities around politics were few and far between. The USLU on the other hand, was seen mostly as an opposition group to the government, with most of its activities consisting of protests and riots. During and after the civil wars however, there has been a proliferation of youth-based and youth-initiated organizations that have helped move Liberia towards sustainable peace through both political and social activism. Specifically, during the 1997 and 2005 elections, youth participation in politics increased significantly. In 2005 for example, hundreds of thousands of young people participated in the elections (or elections-related activities) either as eligible voters or as demonstrators and volunteers at campaign headquarters. Youth engagement around the 2005 elections also included youth as civic educators and election monitors.

THE LIBERIAN NATIONAL YOUTH POLICY: ACHIEVEMENTS

The creation of the NYP marks the first time in the history of Liberia that young people have been fully engaged at the policy level. The existence of the policy is a remarkable achievement with several noteworthy aspects. Specifically, the development of the NYP was surprisingly decentralized; Monrovian youth made a determined effort to include the voices of youth from other parts of the country so that the...
voices of all young people could be heard. Second, the NYP addresses an array of issues including education, gender, economic subsistence, conflict resolution, and self-esteem, among others. Third, it supports the positive elements of youth engagement and demonstrates that youth can be perceived as resources and assets in the peacebuilding process instead of being seen primarily as troublemakers and rebels.

### The Liberian National Youth Policy: Challenges

The NYP also has its drawbacks. The NYP creation process lacked the true engagement of the majority of Liberian young people who live in villages and on farms and who are not well-versed in politics. The trend during the policy-creation process was to bring together the young outspoken Liberians who, even if they weren’t the urban elites from Monrovia, still could afford to go to school and were well educated. While I initially lauded the decentralized nature of the mobilization around the policy, the process still favored elite youth in the cities outside of the capitol and did not include the views and concerns of those youth who cared little about politics but more about their livelihood (e.g., farms).

Equally, the policy-creation process could have been more inclusive of female youth. The document itself is very inclusive of gender issues; however, the number of female participants who participated in the writing of the policy was significantly low. Consequently, much of the document’s gender-specific language lacks sufficient relevance or implementation capacity.

Interestingly, the authors of the document laid out the various challenges facing youth and then attempted to prioritize the most important action items, focusing on education and employment among others. Unfortunately, this selection process had the detrimental effect of removing several important issues from the spotlight. For example, conflict resolution was not included in the priority list, and given the post-war context in Liberia, it is very difficult to focus on issues of education and income if you don’t also address conflict. One reason for this is that the war has influenced young people’s perceptions of wealth, success, and power. Prior to Ellen Johnson Sirleaf’s policy of accountability and transparency, many young people defined success as working for the government because government officials benefited from the rampant corruption and could afford nice cars and generators.

Consequently, in order for the NYP to be effective, it needs to address young people’s perceptions of governance and success in order to avoid the cycle of corruption. In addition, the issues of coexistence and cohesion would need to be addressed, teaching young people to deal with the daily conflicts they face in a proactive way. This would complement and serve as the foundation for the other priority areas selected. Finally, the government’s response remains one of the most central challenges to the policy’s success. The policy is currently pending approval in the executive branch, and without government support, its implementation will be greatly hindered.

### NYP Approval and Implementation

In order to secure approval, awareness of the policy needs to be promoted among Liberian youth. Support for the policy also needs to be demonstrated by young people, local communities, domestic and international non-profit organizations, and from the various government agencies such as the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Sports. Together, these agencies can all play critical roles in pushing the policy forward. Successful implementation of the NYP will also be dependent on several factors including effective youth empowerment through adult partnerships and the incremental implementation of the policy. Youth need to learn from adults who can train, equip, and increase their capacity to achieve. Additionally, in order to avoid donor dependency, policy implementers should identify incremental goals and coordinate the available resources to achieve these goals without outside assistance. To do this, it is important to revisit the plan of action, focus on the non-money-driven aspects of the policy, and begin implementing them.

### Next Steps

The policy cannot be considered the Liberian NYP if it does not include the needs and aspirations of youth across the country. Consequently, information dissemination to raise awareness about the policy...
beyond the national and provincial capitals is essential to engaging youth in rural areas. Equally, donors need to identify and support programs that clearly show the benefits of youth engagement in Liberia’s transition. Local and international organizations can identify areas of the policy implementation that fall directly within their mandates and program frameworks, and begin supporting those aspects of it. This support can be both financial and/or technical in nature, encouraging an attitude of ownership amongst Liberian youth. Lastly, there should be a conscious effort to ensure that the policy remains a national policy that is strongly supported by the government, rather than a policy of the current government that may be affected by a change in a future administration. The pathway toward true post-war youth engagement in politics and policy has begun in Liberia. It is my prayer that the country incrementally builds on this solid foundation and taps into the potential of its most valued resource for reconciliation and development—Liberian youth.
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THE SECURITY PARADIGM

It is widely believed that youth frustration can lead to violence and conflict. Security experts are particularly concerned with young men, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East. Negative media images on TV and film help reinforce the impression that young men from these two regions are, in general, dangerous.

The emphasis on the violent potential of youth distorts underlying realities and obscures the remarkable ability of nearly all youth in Africa, the Middle East, and beyond, to resist involvement in violence even under the most desperate and unstable of circumstances. While research over the past 18 years indicates that youth frustration can lead to violence in some contexts, it is nonetheless far from the norm. In addition, even when it occurs, only a small percentage of youth are involved. Out of perhaps two million male youth in Sierra Leone, for example, it has been estimated that only 20,000 of them were involved as fighters during the civil war. And yet, while popular images of Sierra Leone’s civil war, such as those in the “Blood Diamond” movie, help propagate the idea that just about all young Sierra Leonean males were high on drugs and toting machine guns during the war years, limited information surfaced about the lives of the overwhelming majority of Sierra Leonean youth—about 1,980,000 young people—who remained peaceful and didn’t fight.

The negative linkage between youth and violence is in fact fueled more by our own fear of male youth than by evidence. A consequence is that the international community and governmental institutions are not doing as well as they could in working with youth in part because of the negative starting point from which they approach youth issues.

REINTEGRATION VS. INTEGRATION

Part of the perceived threat of youth in post-conflict contexts arises from the fact that wars tend to transform the social roles of youth. In addition to causing tremendous amounts of trauma and destruction in young peoples’ lives, war can also loosen the reins of society over youth and create a situation where youth redefine their own societal roles. Part of this reinvention is tied to urbanization, which tends to skyrocket during and after wars. Kigali and Pristina, for example, have approximately tripled in size since the end of the wars in Rwanda and Kosovo, respectively. Most of this urbanization is lead by youth. Out of a total population of three and a half million in Liberia, perhaps one in three Liberians live in Monrovia.

In these cities, youth live in parallel worlds in which they create their own subcultures and communities. Many, if not most, youth have no intention of going back either to the confining cultural roles of the past or to their rural homes. They seek integration on new terms that they want to define.

In contrast, the international community promotes the reintegration of youth back into mainstream society. Despite the fact that youth aren’t interested in reintegration and that it is very difficult to achieve, reintegration is, conceptually, what governments and the international community prefer: a return to the sort of status quo that existed before the war. Consequently, youth programs are designed more around institutional priorities than actual youth needs or desires. The tendency for many youth-oriented programs to focus on rural areas in post-conflict countries is an example of this. Another is the trend towards promoting farming and public works programs for youth despite young peoples’ demonstrated preference to migrate and work in urban centers. Government policies, investments, and actions
are thus frequently not youth-centered despite the fact that populations in most countries affected by conflict are youth-dominated. A tragic irony has subsequently developed, in which the majority of a population—non-elite youth—perceive themselves as members of an outcast minority. This creates a challenging, dysfunctional starting point from which to begin talking about democratization and inclusion, particularly when members of the non-elite youth majority are inadequately represented in civil society or government.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC REALITY

We are living in the age of youth. There are more youth today, both in terms of sheer numbers and the proportion of youth in the overall population, than ever before in human history. Approximately 1.5 billion people are between the ages of 14 and 24, 1.3 billion of whom are from developing nations. While the West is getting older overall, the rest of the world is getting younger. In nearly all post-conflict countries, the overwhelming majority of youth are non-elites, many of whom live in urban centers. In Liberia, some non-elite, non-urban youth are referred to as “rebel youth” who exhibit what community members describe as anti-social behaviors, such as cursing, smoking, and drinking. These youth do not participate in communal activities, which tends to upset community elders. Reports suggest that such youth generally don’t attend trainings or youth programs if per diems are not provided. They may not even be invited. Furthermore, female youth, who constitute the most underrepresented and at-risk group in post-conflict societies, may not be training invitees or program participants, either.

The impact of sexual violence is, in general, grossly underappreciated by governments and international agencies in post-war situations. For example, it has been estimated that three in four Liberian women are victims of sexual violence. Female youth are disproportionately victimized by sexual violence during conflicts, and this can impact their participation levels in post-war initiatives. However, many of the youth-oriented programs in post-war contexts that promote gender equity do not adequately recognize that female youth may not want to be co-participants alongside young men after they have been extensively and violently abused. This sort of vital information is often missing when programs are developed or modified because few conduct adequate evaluations of their activities. Indeed, most programs for war-affected youth lack sufficient evidence of positive impact from their programming approaches.

THE LIBERIAN CASE

The demographics of the Liberia case are about as astounding as any country on the globe. The population is extraordinarily young. It is estimated that a mere 4.4 percent of all Liberians are not children or youth. The median age of the population is 18, and the profile of the most typical person in Liberia would probably be an 18-year-old female. Both male and female youth participated in the 1997 elections, the 2004 riots, and the elections of 2005. However, the riots, more than either election, proved to have a greater impact on the youth situation. While there were various reasons why the riots took place in Monrovia in October 2004, it is undisputed that ex-combatant male youth were extremely frustrated and at the center of the rioting. In interviews following the riots, youth referred to promises that the international community and the government had made to them that, in their view, were not kept.

Despite the predominantly peaceful role the youth played in both the 1997 and the 2005 elections, it was the 2004 riots that got the world’s attention. The riots awakened the Liberian leadership to the need to better address youth concerns. Reportedly, it was only after the riots that the Liberian National Youth Policy finally received necessary funding. At the same time, USAID funded a training program to work with ex-combatant youth in the seven neighborhoods in Monrovia where the rioting took place. These responses to the youth riots were impressive, and the National Youth Policy is one of the most encouraging examples of a change in policy aimed at more youth-focused programs. Unfortunately, such action had to first be triggered by violent demonstrations.
**NEXT STEPS**

In order to work with the marginalized, economically disempowered youth majority in war and post-war contexts, we need to frankly ask ourselves how we are going deal with the new and unusual challenges that they present. For example, where does democracy fit on the agenda of most youth? We probably don’t know the answer because members of the non-elite majority are not being asked for their views on this. My guess is that their highest priority probably wouldn’t be elections, unless they’re somehow connected to improving their lot and garnering them some social and political recognition. In general, the voices of most war-affected constituencies—that is, lower-class, undereducated youth in most post-war nations—have yet to be adequately heard, and their needs have yet to be properly addressed.

The starting point, therefore, should be to work with the marginalized, economically disempowered youth majority to determine their realities, needs, and priorities. If we really want to work on representative government in countries in which the demographic majority is youth, then youth programs need to move beyond working with the youth who tend to be reasonably well adjusted and reach out to those that are less well adjusted and more alienated or suspicious of external intervention. Currently, most governments and international agencies don’t have the necessary background information to accurately inform youth-appropriate policy and programming. To move forward, organizations working with youth should address three key elements: gender, class, and location. To do this, we need to understand the world of youth in which reinvention, resilience, alienation, and histories of extreme sexual violence prevail, and figure out ways not just to include these non-elite youth, but to feature them in the work of peacebuilding, nation-building, and reconstruction. Non-elite youth have youth groups too, and most are ready to be engaged.
END NOTES


2. Forty-five percent of the population lives in cities, and the density of the population is 85.2 people per square kilometer. Bosniaks represent 48 percent of the population, Serbs 37.1 percent, and Croats 14.3 percent. The major religions are Islam (40 percent), Orthodox (31 percent), and Roman Catholic (15 percent). The official languages are Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian (CIA World Factbook).

3. Translated as the Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina.


JOHN OTEE IMOITE is executive director of the FORD-People party, the third largest parliamentary party in Kenya. He currently holds the record as the youngest executive director. Imoite is an aspirant for a parliamentary seat in his constituency, a post he also sought in 2002. He holds a bachelor of arts degree from Kenyatta University (Kenya) and is working towards a postgraduate diploma in journalism at the University of Nairobi.

INDIRA KAROVIC is a member of the House of Representatives of the Parliament of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Elected in 2006, she is also a member of the Commission for Information and the Board for Harmonization and Standardization of Texts on Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian languages. She is an active member of the Youth Presidency Organization of her party, the Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Rep. Karovic participated in the Rule of Law, Democracy and Open Society seminars organized in 2005 by the Bosnia and Herzegovina School for Political Studies with support of the Council of Europe. She also took part in the 2003 NDI parliamentary internship program.

EDDIE JARWOLO is the executive director of National Youth Movement for Transparent Elections [NAYMOTE]-Partners for Democratic Development. NAYMOTE, founded by Jarwolo in 2001, is a civil society organization which seeks to provide young Liberians the opportunity to participate in decision-making, governance, leadership, and community service. NAYMOTE has earned immense respect from local and international partners, including the United States Embassy, the National Endowment for Democracy, NDI, the United Nations Development Programme, and the National Elections Commission, among others. Professionally, Jarwolo has also served as program officer of the Media Against AIDS, as project officer for Help Encourage Liberia’s Little Ones, as president of Courage Amongst Students in Hardship, and as program associate of the Global Call to Action Against Poverty. Jarwolo has received training from a number of capacity development initiatives, including the U.S. Department of State International Leadership Visitor Program; the Building Resource in Democracy Governance and Elections program organized by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) in South Africa; and various programs through NDI in computer science, legislative advocacy, focus group research, new tactics in advancing human rights and leadership, development, and community mobilization. He has also participated in a number of international conferences/assemblies including the Third Africa Democracy Forum and the International Civil Society Forum for Democracy 2006 in Doha, Qatar. He graduated from the African Methodist Episcopal Zion University College in 2001 with a bachelor of arts degree in sociology.

BENJAMIN QUINTO is the founder and executive director of the Global Youth Action Network, which today links thousands of youth organizations in over 180 countries. His work over the past ten years includes advocating for youth participation within the United Nations, building strategic alliances among youth organizers, enabling political representation for American youth, speaking at dozens of international forums, and meeting with President Clinton to discuss youth violence in the United States. Quinto consults with Chat the Planet, a worldwide TV series that connects young people for conversation on critical issues, and he co-coordinates Global Youth Service Day, the world’s largest annual celebration of young volunteers.
RANDOLPH CARTER is a children and youth specialist for Search for Common Ground (SFCG). Carter comes to SFCG with extensive experience in programming for children affected by armed conflict. His wealth of experience, which stems from the years of war in his country Liberia, encompasses effective and constructive youth participation, peer mediation, education and conflict resolution, youth mobilization and reintegration, as well as youth program and project facilitation and monitoring.

MARC SOMMERS is an associate research professor of humanitarian studies at the Fletcher School, Tufts University, and a research fellow at Boston University’s African Studies Center. He also works part-time as an international consultant. Across 20 war-affected countries over the past 18 years, Sommers has researched and published extensively on children and youth, child soldiers, education in emergencies, conflict negotiation, forced migration, urbanization, human rights, and coordination issues in humanitarian and post-war reconstruction contexts. He has consulted for policy institutes and numerous donor, UN, and non-governmental agencies, and has received research support from the Ford, Guggenheim, Mellon, and Rotary Foundations. Sommers is currently carrying out research on youth in Rwanda for the World Bank and the influence of terror war tactics, child soldiering, and popular culture in Sierra Leone. His book, Fear in Bongoland: Burundi Refugees in Urban Tanzania received the 2003 Margaret Mead Award.
ELISABETH KVITASHVILI is director of the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation, U.S. Agency for International Development. She is a career Foreign Service Officer with tours in Afghanistan, Russia, and Honduras. She has also spent significant time in the Caucasus, Nepal, Philippines, Bosnia, Rwanda, Burundi, Ethiopia, and Eritrea, working primarily on humanitarian and conflict-related programs. She previously served three years as the director of the Disaster Response and Mitigation Division in the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, and one year in the Office of Transition Initiatives as a senior program officer. She holds a master of arts degree in Near East studies from the University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies, and a diploma in international relations from Paris University School of Political Science.

WILLIAM MILAM, a retired American diplomat, is currently a senior policy scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Milam retired from the U.S. Foreign Service in July 2001. He was recalled after 9/11 and spent nine months thereafter engineer ing the reconstruction of Afghanistan. He has had extensive experience at a variety of posts in the U.S. Foreign Service. He served as ambassador to Bangladesh from 1990 to 1993, was chief of mission in Liberia from 1995 to 1998, and later was the ambassador to Pakistan from 1998 to 2001. He has served abroad in the French West Indies, the United Kingdom, and Cameroon. Milam served as the U.S. special negotiator for Environmental and Scientific Affairs from 1993 to 1995. He has also held a variety of economic posts including the U.S. State Department’s deputy assistant secretary for international finance and development from 1985 to 1990, where he served as the U.S. representative to the Paris Club on the restructuring of foreign debt. He has been extensively decorated and recognized for his service including the James Clement Dunn Award, a Superior Honor Award, a Presidential Meritorious Service Award, and a Presidential Award for Outstanding Service. He received degrees from Stanford University and the University of Michigan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLY</td>
<td>Federation of Liberian Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>Forum for the Restoration of Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GYAN</td>
<td>Global Youth Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANU</td>
<td>Kenyan African National Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYMOTE</td>
<td>National Youth Movement for Transparent Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDI</td>
<td>National Democratic Institute for International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBH</td>
<td>Stranka za Bosnu i Hercegovinu (Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>Search for Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRY</td>
<td>Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULSU</td>
<td>University of Liberia Student Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE PROJECT ON LEADERSHIP AND BUILDING STATE CAPACITY

The Project on Leadership and Building State Capacity, launched in June 2005, expands upon the work of the former Conflict Prevention Project and responds to the growing demand for leadership training directed at both the prevention of violent conflict and the reconstruction of war-torn societies.

There is an emerging awareness of the importance of leadership training in achieving sustainable peace. On a technical level, the art of building democratic state capacity is well understood. But the harder political task—helping the leaders of warring factions achieve their objectives, to work collaboratively in avoiding war or supporting postwar reconstruction and to build democratically accountable links between the governors and the governed—requires a careful examination of the underappreciated “leadership factor” in peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction.

Under the leadership of former Congressman and Presidential Special Envoy Howard Wolpe, the Leadership Project seeks to promote more sustainable approaches to international conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction, first, by conducting in-country training programs designed to strengthen the trust, communication, and negotiation skills among key leaders in countries under stress or emerging from violent conflict; and, second, by stimulating analysis and discussion of ways to achieve more effective and holistic strategies for peacebuilding and strengthening state capacity.
THE WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, established by Congress in 1968 and headquartered in Washington, D.C., is a living national memorial to President Wilson. The Center’s mission is to commemorate the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson by providing a link between the worlds of ideas and policy, while fostering research, study, discussion, and collaboration among a broad spectrum of individuals concerned with policy and scholarship in national and international affairs. Supported by public and private funds, the Center is a nonpartisan institution engaged in the study of national and world affairs. It establishes and maintains a neutral forum for free, open, and informed dialogue. Conclusions or opinions expressed in Center publications and programs are those of the authors and speakers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center staff, fellows, trustees, advisory groups, or any individuals or organizations that provide financial support to the Center.

The Center is the publisher of The Wilson Quarterly and home of Woodrow Wilson Center Press, dialogue radio and television, and the monthly newsletter “Centerpoint.” For more information about the Center’s activities and publications, please visit us on the web at www.wilsoncenter.org.
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